BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08630 054 6

No. 7572.266

a

THE TRVSTEES OF THE PVBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON 1852 1878

GIVEN BY

American Peace Congress.

OFFICIAL REPORT 3

OF THE

THIRTEENTH
UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS

(International) 2

HELD AT

7572.266
a

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, U. S. A.,
OCTOBER THIRD TO EIGHTH,
1904.

3930

BOSTON:
THE PEACE CONGRESS COMMITTEE.
1904

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

THIRTEENTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS

HELD AT

*7571.79

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, U. S. A., OCTOBER THIRD TO EIGHTH, 1904.

REPORTED BY WILLIAM J. ROSE, BOSTON.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE CONGRESS.

BOSTON:
THE PEACE CONGRESS COMMITTEE.
1904

American Peace Congress.
Nov. 14. 1904.

THE THIRTEENTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Andrew D. White	Ithaca, N. Y.
Hon. George F. Edmunds	Philadelphia.
Hon. John W. Foster	Washington.
Hon. Robert Treat Paine	Boston.
Rev. Edward Everett Hale	Boston.
Andrew Carnegie	New York.
Albert K. Smiley	Mohonk Lake, N. Y.
Edward Ginn	Boston.
George Foster Peabody	New York.
Hon. George F. Seward	New York.
Hon. William I. Buchanan	Buffalo.
Pres. Jacob G. Schurman	Ithaca, N. Y.
Pres. Charles W. Eliot	Cambridge, Mass.
Pres. David Starr Jordan	Stanford University, Cal.
Pres. Daniel C. Gilman	Washington.
Pres. Edmund J. James	Urbana, Ill.
William Dean Howells	New York.
Bliss Perry	Boston.
Edwin Burritt Smith	Chicago.
Rev. Hiram W. Thomas	Chicago.
Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones	Chicago.
Prof. Graham Taylor	Chicago.
Rev. Josiah Strong	New York.
Rev. Philip S. Moxom	Springfield, Mass.
Pres. L. Clarke Seelye	Northampton, Mass.
Alfred H. Love	Philadelphia.
Hon. William N. Ashman	Philadelphia.
George G. Mercer	Philadelphia.
Clinton Rogers Woodruff	Philadelphia.
Joshua L. Baily	Philadelphia.
Richard H. Thomas	Baltimore.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson	Cambridge, Mass.
Hon. Samuel W. McCall	Winchester, Mass.
Raymond L. Bridgman	Boston.
Samuel Gompers	Washington.
John Mitchell	Indianapolis.
Edwin D. Mead	Boston.
Benjamin F. Trueblood	Boston.
Mrs. May Wright Sewall	Indianapolis.
Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey	Winthrop Centre, Me.
Mrs. Julia Ward Howe	Boston.
Mrs. Mary A. Livermore	Melrose, Mass.
Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell	New York.
Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer	New York.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead	Boston.
Miss Jane Addams	Chicago.
Miss M. Carey Thomas	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Miss Grace H. Dodge	New York.

Cardinal Gibbons	Baltimore.
Bishop John L. Spalding	Peoria, Ill.
Bishop William Lawrence	Boston.
Bishop Henry W. Warren	University Park, Col.
Edward Atkinson	Boston.
Samuel B. Capen	Boston.
Edward H. Clement	Boston.
Philip C. Garrett	Philadelphia.
Moorfield Storey	Boston.
Walter S. Logan	New York.
Rev. Charles F. Dole	Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Felix Adler	New York.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson	New York.
Prof. John B. Clark	New York.
Rev. Francis E. Clark	Boston.
Hon. George S. Boutwell	Boston.
Samuel Bowles	Springfield, Mass.
George T. Angell	Boston.
Augustine Jones	Newton Highlands, Mass.
L. H. Pillsbury	Derry, N. H.
Hon. William L. Putnam	Portland, Me.
Leander T. Chamberlain	New York.
Herbert Welsh	Philadelphia.
J. G. Phelps Stokes	New York.
Cleveland H. Dodge	New York.
Hon. Oscar S. Straus	New York.
Hon. George Gray	Wilmington, Del.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION.

Edwin D. Mead, *Chairman.*

Benjamin F. Trueblood, *Secretary.*

Walter S. Logan.
Hon. George F. Seward.
John B. Garrett.
Hon. William N. Ashman.
Richard H. Thomas.

Edwin Burritt Smith.
Prof. Graham Taylor.
Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey.
Mrs. Charles Russell Lowell.
Mrs. May Wright Sewall.

TREASURER OF THE COMMITTEE.

David Greene Haskins	5 Tremont Street, Boston,

OFFICERS OF THE CONGRESS.

PRESIDENT.

Hon. Robert Treat Paine . . . . . . Boston

SECRETARY.

Benjamin F. Trueblood . . . . . . Boston

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

AUSTRIA.

The Baroness von Suttner . . . . . . Vienna

ARMENIA.

Dr. Jean Loris Melikoff . . . . 3 Avenue de l'Observatoire, Paris

BELGIUM.

Senator Houzeau de Lehaie . . . . . . Mons

CHINA.

Dr. Yamei Kin . . . . . . Care of Mrs. Ole Bull, Cambridge, Mass.

DENMARK.

Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood . . . . . . Washington, D. C.

FRANCE.

Prof. Theodore Ruyssen . . . . . . Aix-en-Provence

GERMANY.

Dr. Adolf Richter . . . . . . Pforzheim

GREAT BRITAIN.

William Randal Cremer, M. P. . . . . 11 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London

INDIA.

Baba Bharati . . . . . . Brindaban

ITALY.

Ernesto Teodoro Moneta . . . . . . Milan

JAPAN.

Jiro Abratani . . . . . . Kioto

MONACO.

The Abbe Pichot . . . . . . Monaco

NORWAY.

Hon. John Lund . . . . . . Bergen

RUSSIA.

Dr. M. Chirug . . . . . . Boston

SWEDEN.

Hon. John Olsson . . . . . . Stockholm

SWITZERLAND.

Pierre Clerget . . . . . . Le Locle

UNITED STATES.

Albert K. Smiley . . . . . . Mohonk Lake, N. Y.

The list of members of the Congress and of the Societies represented in it will be found at the end of this Report.

PREFACE.

The delegates from the peace societies of the United States to the Twelfth Universal Peace Congress held at Rouen, France, at the end of September, 1903, extended a cordial invitation to the Congress to meet in 1904 in the United States during the time of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. This invitation, which was supported by more than fifty prominent men and women of the United States, who had gladly consented to the use of their names, was accepted as heartily as it was given.

In order to commence the arrangements for the Congress, a meeting of representatives of the peace societies of the United States, and of interested individuals outside of the societies, was held in the New Willard Hotel, Washington, on the 13th of January, 1904, just after the close of the National Arbitration Conference. At this meeting an Executive Committee of twelve (whose names are given on page 3) was appointed to act, in conjunction with the Peace Bureau at Berne, as the Committee on Organization of the Congress. To this Committee all the details of the preparation for the Congress were referred. At the same meeting the fifty and more persons who had supported the invitation at Rouen were constituted a General Committee to promote the interests of the Congress and the Committee on Organization was empowered to increase the number of the General Committee at their discretion.

The Committee on Organization met at the Arts Club in New York on the 13th of February, and chose Edwin D. Mead, Chairman, and Benjamin F. Trueblood, Secretary. After a full discussion of the place at which the Congress might most properly and successfully be held, Boston was unanimously chosen rather than St. Louis, which had also been proposed. The Chairman and Secretary of the Committee were thereupon appointed to act as a local Executive Committee with the full powers of the whole Committee on Organization.

This Committee at once began active work, and during the summer issued frequent Peace Congress Bulletins and carried on a wide correspondence, both at home and abroad, in preparing for the Congress. The Mayor and citizens of Boston manifested from the first an active interest in the subject, and gave the Committee valuable aid in many ways. Generous response was made not only by the citizens of Boston, but also of New York, Philadelphia and other places, to the appeal for funds, and thus the Committee was enabled to lay the plans for the Congress on a broader and more generous scale than has been possible in the case of any previous congress.

The preliminary meetings held before the opening of the Congress were most successful. Many of the churches of Boston and vicinity and of other cities throughout the country devoted at least one of their Sunday services October 2 to the subject of peace. The addresses given at the union religious service Sunday afternoon at Tremont Temple by Dr. Francis H. Rowley of Boston, Rev. Walter Walsh of Dundee, Scotland, Rev. A. L. Lilley of England, Rabbi

Berkowitz of Philadelphia, Dr. Reuen Thomas of Brookline, and Dr. Charles G. Ames of Boston, were strong and clear presentations of the claims of the peace cause on the whole religious world. The musical consecration service in Symphony Hall on Sunday evening, when the Handel and Haydn Society, with a chorus of four hundred voices and a full orchestra, presented to a crowded house a rich program of music of the highest order, and the Bishop of Hereford, England, gave an excellent short address on the opportunity and duty of America to take the lead in the pacific civilization of the world, won the admiration of all who attended.

The Committee herewith present the stenographic report of the proceedings of the Congress, including the addresses given at the public meetings in Boston and a brief résumé of the numerous successful and influential meetings held after its close in several cities. They have thought it wise, also, to prefix to the Report a brief account of the preceding peace congresses, not only of those held in the modern series beginning in 1889, but also of the remarkable series of congresses held from 1843 to 1853.

INTRODUCTION.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE PEACE CONGRESSES.

The first International Peace Congress was held in London in June, 1843, just after the great Anti-Slavery Convention. The closing meeting was in Exeter Hall. The suggestion which led to this Congress was made by Joseph Sturge, the distinguished English anti-slavery reformer, then on a visit to the United States, at a meeting of peace workers in Boston in 1841, presided over by Amasa Walker. The American Peace Society took the matter up at once, communicated with the British Peace Society, and arrangements were quickly completed for the Congress. It was attended by three hundred and thirty-seven delegates, two hundred and ninety-four of whom were from Great Britain, thirty-seven from America, and six from the continent of Europe. The president of the Congress was Charles Hindley, M. P. Among the leaders in the meetings were Richard Cobden, Dr. George C. Beckwith, Prof. Amasa Walker, Rev. Joshua Leavitt, Rev. A. A. Phelps, and Lewis and John Tappan. An address to the governments of the world was adopted, and presented to the British government, then headed by Sir Robert Peel, by a deputation of which the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld was the chairman. It was also presented to the King of Belgium, then on a visit to London.

The second Peace Congress was held at Brussels in September, 1848. Elihu Burritt was the moving spirit in the organization of this Congress. The president of the Congress was Mr. Visschers, a distinguished member of the Belgian government. Though looked forward to with anxiety on account of the disturbed condition of public affairs in Europe, it proved to be a great success. Among those participating in the proceedings were Mr. Edmund Fry of England, Mr. Bouvet of the French Assembly, Baron de Reiffenberg of the Belgian Royal Academy, Professor Roussel of the University of Brussels, Henry Richard, Joseph Sturge, Elihu Burritt, Bertinatti of Italy, Henry Vincent of London, and Mr. Henry Clapp of Cincinnati. About three hundred delegates attended, one hundred and thirty of whom were from Great Britain, two from the United States, and the rest from various European countries.

The third Congress was held at Paris in August, 1849. It was a very large and enthusiastic gathering. It was presided over by Victor Hugo, whose remarkable address has been oftener quoted, perhaps, than any other peace discourse. Among the distinguished men participating in the Congress were Elihu Burritt, Henry Richard, Richard Cobden, Amasa Walker, Mr. Visschers of Belgium, President Mahan of Oberlin College, Henry Vincent of London, Athanase Coquerel, Mr. Bouvet, Emile de Girardin, Frederic Bastiat, and Mr. Hindley, M. P. More than three hundred delegates attended from Great Britain, one hundred from France, twenty-three from the United States, nineteen from Belgium, and a considerable number from Italy, Switzerland and Germany. Resolutions on arbitration, disarmament, the iniquity and needlessness of war, etc., were passed as at the preceding congresses.

The fourth Congress was held at Frankfort, Germany, in August, 1850. It was organized by Elihu Burritt and Henry Richard, with the coöperation of a strong local committee of arrangements. Mr. Jaup, ex-Prime Minister of Hesse-Darmstadt, presided. The interest and enthusiasm were as great as in the Paris Congress of the previous year. Many of the distinguished men who were at Paris attended this Congress also. About five hundred persons went over from England. More than twenty delegates went from the United States, some of them coming from as far West as Kentucky, Michigan and Missouri. The leading spirits of the Congress were nearly the same as in the preceding congresses, and the resolutions were along similar lines. The Congress gave special attention to a code of international law and the subject of dueling. The peace societies organized as a result of this Congress, the first societies in Germany, were shortly afterwards suppressed by the government.

The fifth of this series of Congresses was held in Exeter Hall, London, in July, 1851. Owing to the International Exposition meeting in London that year, the Congress was successful beyond all expectation. There were more than a thousand delegates from England alone, representing, as a contemporary report says, "a large amount of the highest elements of English society, its intelligence, its moral and religious worth." Sixteen different States of the American Union were represented by over sixty delegates. Thirty-eight delegates came from Germany, twenty from France, and a considerable number from other European countries. The president of the Congress was Sir David Brewster, the most eminent physicist of his time. The same speakers, with slight exception, who had pleaded the cause so eloquently in the two preceding congresses were present. Many distinguished men in different parts of the world sent expressions of sympathy to the Congress.

This first remarkable series of Peace Congresses was terminated by two British conferences held in 1853. The first of these was at Manchester, England, in January. It was chiefly a demonstration of the English advocates of peace against the "paroxysm of apprehension of a French invasion." George Wilson, chairman of the Anti-Corn Law League, presided, and powerful addresses were delivered by both John Bright and Richard Cobden. The call for the conference was signed by seventeen members of Parliament and about five hundred other gentlemen of distinction. Six hundred delegates attended and letters of approval and sympathy were received from about four hundred who could not be present. The conference sent a deputation to present an address to the Prime Minister, the Earl of Aberdeen. The second conference of 1853 was held at Edinburgh in October, and was large and enthusiastic. The Lord Provost of Edinburgh presided. The leading peace workers of England were all present, including both Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden.

All of these Congresses from 1843 to 1853 dealt with practically the same subjects which have occupied the attention of the recent Peace Congresses, and the detailed account of the resolutions adopted is therefore not necessary.

The Crimean War, which then came on, and the other great wars of that period in Europe and America, made the holding of further Peace Congresses for the time impracticable, and a whole generation passed before the modern series began.

The first of the present series of Peace Congresses was held at Paris in the Trocadero Palace from the 23d to the 27th of June, 1889. The previous year eight peace societies, six of them from France, one from England and one from the United States, united in proposing that a Peace Congress be held in Paris the next year during the Exposition. A committee of twenty was chosen to take the initiatory steps. On this committee are found the names of Frederic Passy and Hodgson Pratt, since distinguished for their eminent peace services. The committee held frequent meetings and secured the coöperation of nearly a hundred societies in different countries. When the Congress met on the 23d of June it was found that three hundred and ten delegates from nine countries were present, one hundred and thirty-five of whom were from outside of France. The countries most largely represented were England, France, Italy and the United States. The honorary presidents of the Congress were Mr. A. Frank, a member of the Institute of France, and Dr. Charles Lemonnier, founder of the International League of Liberty and Peace. Frederic Passy served as president of the Congress, and on taking the chair pronounced an eloquent discourse in which he set forth the great ideas of which he is to this day one of the foremost advocates. The names of the persons who took a leading part in the deliberations were Mr. Hodgson Pratt, W. Evans Darby, Dr. Charles Lemonnier, Mr. Frederic Passy, Mr. Auguste Desmoulins, Dr. A. A. Miner, Angelo Mazzoleni, E. T. Moneta, Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood, Julie Toussaint, Miss P. H. Peckover, Madame Griess-Traut, Mr. Thomas Snape, Rev. R. B. Howard, Dr. Charles Richet, Mr. Frederic Bajer, Senator Marcoartu, J. G. Alexander, Henri La Fontaine, William Randall Cremer, and Felix Moscheles. The Congress did its work by means of six committees which prepared the resolutions. A long list of resolutions and wishes was adopted covering practically all the subjects which have since been so fully discussed in the subsequent Peace Congresses, the conferences of the Interparliamentary Union, and the special national and local conferences since held. The Congress received warm hospitality from the French government, President Carnot himself giving the delegates a reception. Before closing the Congress expressed the desire that another congress might meet and that all the peace societies, without distinction of race or religion, be invited to send delegates.

The second Congress was held in Westminster Town Hall, London, from the 14th to the 19th of July, 1890. This Congress was organized by a strong committee from the English peace societies, of which Mr. Hodgson Pratt was the chairman. The deliberations were preceded by an afternoon service in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, the 13th of July, at which the preacher was Rev. Canon H. Scott Holland. The business committee of the Congress consisted of Sir Joseph Pease, M. P., President of the British Peace Society, Rev. R. B. Howard, Secretary of the American Peace Society, Frederic Passy from France, Fredrik Bajer of Denmark, E. T. Borg from Sweden and Norway, Madam Fisher-Lette from Germany, and E. T. Moneta from Italy. Hon. David Dudley Field of New York was made president of the Congress.

Delegates were present from fourteen countries. The number from Great Britain was very large, including delegates from fifty-eight peace and arbitration societies and other organizations. Delegates were sent from the United States by the American Peace Society, the Christian Arbitration and Peace Society of Philadelphia, the Universal Peace Union of Philadelphia, the Peace Department of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Rhode Island Peace Society, the churches of Richmond, Va., and the Friends' Yearly Meetings of both New York and New England. The total number of delegates in the Congress was over four hundred.

This Congress was conspicuous for the number of carefully prepared papers which were read. Among the speakers and persons who read papers were Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Joseph W. Pease, Hodgson Pratt, W. Evans Darby, George Gillet of London, the Abbé Defourny from France, Rev. C. B. Smith of Boston, E. T. Moneta of Milan, Henry Stanley Newman of Leominster, England, J. B. Braithwaite of London, Frederic Passy of Paris, Mrs. Fisher-Lette of Germany, Rev. J. P. Gledstone of London, Dr. Charles Richet of Paris, Dr. Reuen Thomas of Boston, Senator Marcoartu from Spain, W. Martin Wood of London, Emile Arnaud of France, Augustine Jones of Providence, R. I., Miss Ellen Robinson of Liverpool, Fredrik Bajer of Copenhagen, Thomas Snape of Liverpool, Rev. R. B. Howard, Rev. George Dana Boardman of Philadelphia, Dr. W. U. Murkland of Baltimore, and others. The report of this Congress is a very valuable peace document.

A reception was given to the delegates by the Lord Mayor of London at the Mansion House. The resolutions adopted by the Congress were numerous, covering nearly the whole field of the peace propaganda. The Congress before closing voted to send an address to the heads of all civilized states. Through the courtesy of Queen Victoria the delegates were admitted to Windsor Castle at the close of the Congress.

In the third Congress, which met at Rome, from the 11th to the

16th of November, 1891, seventeen countries were represented by four hundred and fifty delegates; namely, Germany, England, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, the United States, France, Hungary, Italy, Norway, The Netherlands, Portugal, Roumania, Servia, Sweden, and Switzerland. The opening session of the Congress was held in the hall of the Chamber of Deputies, and the other sessions at the Fine Arts Palace. The Congress was presided over by Mr. Ruggero Bonghi, a distinguished member of the Cabinet; and Mr. Giuseppe Biancheri, the President of the Chamber of Deputies, was in attendance at the opening session to express to the delegates the welcome and sympathy of the Italian government. This was the first peace congress in which the Baroness von Suttner, since distinguished throughout the civilized world for her labors in the cause, took part. It was at this Congress that the proposition was first made to create a Permanent International Peace Bureau. This proposition was submitted by Mr. Hodgson Pratt of England, Fredrik Bajer of Denmark, and Dr. Charles Lemonnier in the name of several French societies. The preliminary steps taken at the time resulted in the definite organization of the Bureau the next year. The chief participants in the Congress were the same persons that had taken part in the London Congress the previous year, though there were many new delegates, especially from the southern European nations. The subjects discussed were arbitration, disarmament, international law, pacific instruction in schools, the economic aspects of war, the influence of the press, etc. The Congress was a very enthusiastic and successful one, and resulted in firmly establishing and widely extending the peace movement among the Latin nations of southern Europe.

Berne, Switzerland, was the seat of the fourth Congress, which was held from the 22d to the 27th of August, 1892, in the Hall of the Swiss National Council. Mr. Louis Ruchonnet, who had served two terms as President of the Swiss Republic, was chosen president. The Congress was attended by over four hundred delegates and adherents from thirteen countries. The International Peace Bureau at Berne was definitely established at this time, and articles of incorporation adopted under which the Bureau was subsequently incorporated under the laws of the Swiss Republic. At this Congress, also, the subject of an international tribunal of arbitration began to take more definite shape than in the previous congresses. The program of the Congress was a long one, covering many phases of the question of war and peace. Steps were also taken to bring associations of working men into more sympathetic relation with the peace societies.

The Peace Congress held at Chicago from the 14th to the 20th of August, 1893, was the fifth in the series. It was held under the auspices of the World's Congress Auxiliary, of which Hon. Charles C. Bonney was president, Benjamin F. Trueblood, Secretary of the American Peace Society, being Chairman of the Committee of Organization. The president of the Congress was the Hon. Josiah

Quincy, then Assistant Secretary of State. Thirty-one peace societies and other organizations sent ninety-two delegates, and there were two hundred and twenty-four other members of the Congress. This Congress was notable for the number of carefully prepared papers submitted to it. Among the authors of papers were Dr. W. Evans Darby and William C. Braithwaite of London, Mr. Elie Ducommun, Secretary of the Berne Peace Bureau, David Dudley Field of New York, Angelo Mazzoleni and E. T. Moneta of Milan, Italy, Dr. Adolf Richter of Pforzheim, Germany, Gen. Charles H. Howard of Chicago, Sir Edmund Hornby of London, Dr. Edward Everett Hale of Boston, Dr. F. J. Tomkins of Denver, Hon. William E. Curtis of Washington, Mr. Peraza of Venezuela, Mr. Peralta of Costa Rica, Hodgson Pratt of London, Ex-Gov. John W. Hoyt, Dr. George Dana Boardman of Philadelphia, and others. To this Congress was submitted a carefully prepared plan of a permanent international court of arbitration, drafted by Messrs. William Allen Butler, Dorman B. Eaton and Cephas Brainerd of the New York Bar. Papers on the conflicts between labor and capital were presented by Mr. Charles H. Wolcott, president of the Massachusetts State Board of Arbitration, Prof. William W. Folwell of the University of Minnesota, and Mr. H. H. Aldrich of the Chicago Board of Trade. Sunday, the last day of the Congress, was devoted to a religious peace service in which the moral and religious aspects of the peace movement were presented by Dr. George Dana Boardman, Dr. Philip S. Moxom of Boston, and Rev. Julius E. Grammer of Baltimore. The report of this Congress, covering three hundred and thirty-two pages, published by the American Peace Society, and containing all the papers read, is one of the most valuable peace documents of recent times.

The sixth of this series of Congresses was held at Antwerp, Belgium, from the 29th of August to the 1st of September, 1894, during the Antwerp Universal Exposition. It was organized under the auspices of King Leopold of Belgium, who issued a special decree for the creation of a Central Commission of Patronage, consisting of twenty-nine eminent citizens of Belgium. The honorary president of this commission was Baron de Moreau of Brussels, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, who was also made honorary president of the Congress. Mr. Houzeau de Lehaie, one of the best known statesmen of Belgium and since made a senator, was president of the Congress. Seventy-two societies in twelve different countries were represented by about two hundred delegates. The meetings of the Congress were held in the Royal Athenæum, and the subjects discussed were treaties of arbitration, the reform of international law, a permanent court of arbitration, a truce of armaments and various questions of propaganda. The Congress issued an address to the principal powers of Europe urging them jointly to offer their good offices in order to restore peace between China and Japan. An appeal to the nations in favor of peace was also issued by the Congress, as had been done two years before at Berne, and as has since been done at the close of each of the Peace Congresses.

The seventh Peace Congress held at Budapest, Hungary, from the 17th to the 22d of September, 1896, was attended by two hundred and sixty delegates and adherents, and was one of the most enthusiastic and influential held up to that time. The Congress held its sessions in the City Hall of Budapest, and was presided over by Gen. Etienne Türr, formerly of the staff of King Victor Emanuel I. of Italy. The leaders of the peace movement from the different countries of Europe were nearly all present, and many new persons from Eastern and Southeastern Europe. This Congress, in addition to discussing the subject of a permanent court of arbitration, treaties of arbitration, a truce of armaments, and various phases of the question of propaganda, gave special attention to the subject of European colonies in Africa, a European customs union, the principles of international law, manuals of history, foreign residents and the duel.

The eighth Peace Congress was held at Hamburg, Germany, from October 12th to 16th, 1897. The interest shown by the citizens of Hamburg and vicinity was most extraordinary. The opening meeting was held in the largest hall in Hamburg and attended by fully four thousand people, the largest part of whom remained until nearly midnight listening to addresses from the representatives from different countries. Dr. Adolf Richter, president of the German Peace Society, presided. There was no recognition of the Congress by the German government. The subjects discussed were the usual ones, but special attention was given to international committees of conciliation, to the report of a commission on the transformation of armies into productive organizations, to an international language and to the coöperation of teachers in peace work. The number of members was about one hundred and fifty delegates and about the same number of adherents.

The ninth Congress was held at Paris from the 30th of September to the 5th of October, 1900, no congress having been held the two previous years on account principally of the Czar's Conference at The Hague. This Congress at Paris during the Exposition of 1900 was attended by about six hundred persons from twenty-eight countries, and was very influential. The honorary president was Frederic Passy, and the president Dr. Charles Richet, Professor in the Medical Faculty of the University of Paris. The French government sent Mr. Millerand, the Minister of Commerce, to welcome the delegates on its behalf. No Peace Congress has ever been more courageous and outspoken in its condemnation of all unjust colonial and other policies which lead to misunderstanding and war. A good deal of time was given to the South African War, then in progress, and to the general relations of strong peoples with weak ones. The policy of the powers in the East which led to the Boxer outbreak in China was strongly condemned. John de Bloch presented in person to this Congress his views of the practical impossibility of a war between great powers at the present time. An address to the President of the French Republic was voted, expressing great appreciation of his services to the cause, and invoking his further help in carrying out the ideals of the friends of peace.

The tenth Peace Congress was held in St. Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, Scotland, from the 10th to the 13th of September, 1901, during the Glasgow Exposition. It was received with great courtesy by the City Government of Glasgow, at whose head was the Hon. Samuel Chisholm, LL. D. The public reception given to the delegates by the Lord Provost in the City Hall has never in the history of the Peace Congresses been surpassed in generosity and brilliancy. This Congress was, nevertheless, over-shadowed and trammeled in its work by the influence of the South African War, then going on. Local interest in the proceedings was, on account of the war, not very great, though there were about the usual number of delegates present, including practically all of the leaders in the peace movement in different countries. The usual subjects were discussed and strong resolutions adopted. A large and influential public meeting was held one evening in the City Hall at Paisley and attended by more than six hundred workingmen. The Congress was preceded by a conference of the churches on Monday, September 9, in the interests of peace, at which some of the ablest addresses of the week were given by Joshua Rowntree, Dr. Robert Spence Watson, Mr. J. H. Midgley, Dr. Richard H. Thomas of Baltimore, Rev. M. J. Elliott, Dr. J. Rendel Harris of Cambridge, Rev. Canon Barker of London, Dr. Alexander Mackennal of Manchester, Miss Ellen Robinson of Liverpool, and Prof. Sylvanus P. Thompson.

The eleventh Congress was held in 1902 from the 2d to the 6th of April at Monaco, under the auspices of Prince Albert of Monaco. The Congress was welcomed on behalf of Prince Albert by the Governor-General O. Ritt, who was made honorary president. The president was Mr. Gaston Moch, Privy Councillor of the Prince and a member of the International Peace Bureau. Two hundred and twenty-three delegates were present from twenty-three countries. Many of the societies accustomed to send delegates to the Peace Congresses sent none to this one. The attendance was large from southern European countries, and the interest and enthusiasm great. The result of the Congress was a wide extension of interest in the peace cause among the inhabitants of southern Europe.

The twelfth Peace Congress, one of the most successful in the whole series, was held at Rouen and Hâvre, France, from the 22d to the 27th of September, 1903. More than five hundred persons from twenty countries attended. The Congress was noteworthy in having as its honorary president Mr. Loubet, the President of the French Republic. The Minister of Commerce, Mr. Trouillot, attended on behalf of the government one of the sessions at Hâvre, and delivered a remarkable address to more than two thousand people. The Congress was a revelation of the breadth and depth of the hold which the peace movement has taken upon the French people. The discussions were eminently practical, and have never been surpassed in ability, clearness and directness by those of any other Peace Congress. The subject of a reduction of armaments was taken out of the domain of theory and dealt with as the most urgent practical question of the day. Nearly a whole day was given to it, and the President of the French Republic was invited by resolution to take the initiative in calling a new International Conference to deal with the problem. The Congress also gave much attention to the questions of Macedonia, Armenia, South Africa and Venezuela. The extension and completion of the work of the Hague Court and the establishment of a general reign of law in place of force in international affairs were prominently dealt with. The work of the Congress did much to hasten the signing of the treaty of arbitration between France and Great Britain, which occurred soon after its close, and which has since been followed by the signing of more than a dozen other similar treaties.

THE THIRTEENTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS

BOSTON, OCTOBER 3–8, 1904.

Opening Session.

Monday, October 3, 2 P. M.

The opening session of the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress was held on Monday, October 3, at Tremont Temple, Boston, at 2 o'clock.

EDWIN D. MEAD, Chairman of the Committee on Organization, opened the meeting, and after a chorus by the Parker Memorial Choir, said:

The highest victory of great power is that of self-restraint. It would be a beneficent result of this meeting, this ecumenical council, if it taught us all that mutual knowledge of each other which should modify prejudices, restrain acerbity of thought and expression, and tend in some degree to bring in that blessed time

> " When light shall spread, and man be liker man
> Through all the season of the Golden Year."

" If the press of the world would adopt and persist in the high resolve that war should be no more, the clangor of arms would cease from the rising of the sun to its going down, and we could fancy that at last our ears, no longer stunned by the din of armies, might hear the morning stars singing together and all the sons of God shouting for joy." [Applause.]

Those words, members of the Peace Congress, whom we welcome to-day, and friends, are not my words; they are words spoken at the International Press Association in St. Louis a few weeks ago. They might have been addressed with equal appropriateness to an ecumenical council of the commercial men of the world, or the teachers of religion. They were spoken by the Hon. John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States. [Great applause.]

It is with those words ringing in our ears that we have rejoiced that the Secretary of State of the United States to-day is the Hon. John Hay, and that he is with us to speak the opening words at this Thirteenth International Peace Congress. We welcome, and I have the honor to present to you, the Hon. John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States. [Great applause, the entire audience rising.]

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN HAY, SECRETARY OF STATE.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I esteem it a great honor and privilege to be allowed to extend to you the welcome of the government and the people of the United States of America on this memorable and auspicious occasion. No time could be more fitting for this gathering of a parliament of peace than to-day, when at the other end of the world the thunder of a destructive and sanguinary war is deafening the nations, while here we are preparing to settle the question of a vast transfer of power by an appeal to reason and orderly procedure, under the sanction of a law implicitly accepted by eighty millions of people.

And as if heaven had deigned to give a sign of deepest significance to the hour of your meeting, it coincides with the commitment to eternal peace of all that was mortal of our dear and honored co-laborer in this sacred cause. George Frisbie Hoar had many titles to glory and honor; not the least of them was the firm and consistent valor with which through all his illustrious life he pleaded for humanity and universal goodwill. [Applause.]

And surely no place for your meeting could be more suitable than this high-hearted city, which has been for nearly three hundred years the birthplace and the home of every idea of progress and enlightenment which has germinated in the Western World. To bid you welcome to the home of Vane, of Winthrop, and of Adams, of Channing and Emerson, is to give you the freedom of no mean city, to make you partakers of a spiritual inheritance without which, with all our opulence, we should be poor indeed. It is true that this great Commonwealth has sought, with the sword, peace under liberty. We confess that many wars have left their traces on the pages of its history and its literature; art has adorned the public places of this stately town with the statues of its heroic sons. But the dominant note of its highest culture, its most persistent spirit, has been that righteousness which exalteth a nation, that obedience to the inner light which leads along the paths of peace. [Applause.]

And the policy of the nation at large, which owes so much of its civic spirit to the founders of New England, has been in the main a policy of peace. During the hundred and twenty years of our independent existence we have had but three wars with the outside world, though we have had a most grievous and dolorous struggle with our own people. We have had, I think, a greater relative immunity from war than any of our neighbors. All our greatest men have been earnest advocates of peace. The very men who founded our liberties with the mailed hand detested and abhorred war as the most futile and ferocious of human follies. Franklin and Jefferson repeatedly denounced it — the one with all the energy of his rhetoric, the other with the lambent fire of his wit.

But not our philosophers alone — our fighting men have seen at close quarters how hideous is the face of war. Washington said, "My first wish is to see this plague to mankind banished from the earth"; and again he said, "We have experienced enough of its evils in this country to know that it should not be wantonly or unnecessarily entered upon." There is no discordant note in the utterances of our most eminent soldiers on this subject. The most famous utterance of General Grant — the one which will linger longest in the memories of men — was the prayer of his war-weary heart, "Let us have peace." [Applause.] Sherman reached the acme of his marvelous gift of epigram when he said, "War is hell." And Abraham Lincoln, after the four terrible years in which he had directed our vast armies and navies, uttered on the threshold of eternity the fervent and touching aspiration that "the mighty scourge of war might speedily pass away."

There has been no solution of continuity in the sentiments of our Presidents on this subject up to this day. McKinley deplored with every pulse of his honest and kindly heart the advent of the war which he had hoped might not come in his day, and gladly hailed the earliest moment for making peace; and President Roosevelt has the same tireless energy in the work of concord that he displayed when he sought peace and ensued it on the field of battle. No Presidents in our history have been so faithful and so efficient as the last two in the cause of arbitration and of every peaceful settlement of differences. I mention them together because their work has been harmonious and consistent. We hailed with joy the generous initiative of the Russian Emperor, and sent to the Conference at The Hague the best men we had in our civic and military life. When the Hague Court lay apparently wrecked at the beginning of its voyage, threatened with death before it had fairly begun to live, it was the American government which gave it the breath of life by inviting the Republic of Mexico to share our appeal to its jurisdiction; and the second case brought before it was at the instance of Mr. Roosevelt, who declined in its favor the high honor of arbitrating an affair of world-wide importance. [Applause.]

I beg you to believe it is not by way of boasting that I recall these incidents to your minds; it is rather as a profession of faith in a cause which the present Administration has deeply at heart that I ask you to remember, in the deliberations upon which you are entering, the course to which the American government is pledged and which it has steadily pursued for the last seven years. It is true that in those years we have had a hundred days of war, but they put an end forever to bloodshed which had lasted a generation. We landed a few platoons of marines on the isthmus last year; but that act closed without a shot a sanguinary succession of trivial wars. We marched a little army to Peking; but it was to save not only the beleagured legations, but a great imperiled civilization. By mingled gentleness and energy, to which most of the world beyond our borders has done justice, we have given to the Philippines, if not peace, at least a nearer approach to it than they have had within the memory of men.

If our example is worth anything to the world, we have given it in the vital matter of disarmament. We have brought away from the Far East 55,000 soldiers whose work was done, and have sent them back to the fields of peaceful activity. We have reduced our army to its minimum of 60,000 men; in fact, we may say we have no army, but in place of one a nucleus for drill and discipline. We have three-fourths of one soldier for every one thousand of our population [applause] — a proportion which if adopted by other powers would at once eliminate wars and rumors of war from the daily thoughts of the chanceries of the world. [Applause.]

But fixed as our tradition is, clear as is our purpose in the direction of peace, no country is permanently immune to war so long as the desire and the practice of peace are not universal. If we quote Washington as an advocate of peace, it is but fair also to quote him where he says, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." And at another time he said, "To an active external commerce the protection of a naval force is indispensable. To secure respect to a neutral flag requires a naval force organized and ready to vindicate it from insult or aggression."

To acknowledge the existence of an evil is not to support or approve it; but the facts must be faced. Human history is one long, desolate story of bloodshed. All the arts unite in the apparent conspiracy to give precedence to the glory of arms. Demosthenes and Pericles adjured the Athenians by the memory of their battles. Horace boasted that he had been a soldier, *non sine gloria.* Even Milton, in that sublime sonnet where he said, "Peace hath her victories no less than those of war," also mentioned among the godly trophies of Cromwell, "Darwent's stream with blood of Scots imbued." In almost every sermon and hymn we hear in our churches the imagery of war and battle is used. We are charged to "fight the good fight of faith"; we are to "sail through bloody seas" to win the prize. The Christian soldier is constantly marshaled to war. Not only in our habits and customs, but in our daily speech and in our inmost thoughts we are beset by the obsession of conflict and mutal destruction. It is like the law of sin in the members to which the greatest of the Apostles refers: "Who shall deliver us from the body of this death?"

I am speaking to those who recognize the lamentable state of things and who yet do not accept it, or submit to it, and who hope that through the shadow of this night we shall sweep into a younger day. [Applause.] How is this great deliverance to be accomplished?

We have all recently read that wonderful sermon on war by Count Tolstoy, in which a spirit of marvelous lucidity and fire, absolutely detached from geographical or political conditions, speaks the Word as it has been given him to speak it, and as no other living man could have done. As you read, with an aching heart, his terrible arraignment of war, feeling that as a man you are partly responsible for all human atrocities, you wait with impatience for the remedy he shall propose, and you find it is — Religion. Yes, that is the remedy.

If all would do right, nobody would do wrong — nothing is plainer. It is a counsel of perfection, satisfactory to prophets and saints, to be reached in God's good time. But you are here to consult together to see whether the generation now alive may not do something to hasten the coming of the acceptable day, the appearance on earth of the beatific vision. If we cannot at once make peace and goodwill the universal rule and practice of nations, what can we do to approximate this condition? What measures can we now take which may lead us at least a little distance toward the wished-for goal?

I have not come to advise you; I have no such ambitious pretensions. I do not even aspire to take part in your deliberations. But I am authorized to assure you that the American government extends to you a cordial and sympathetic welcome, and shares to the utmost the spirit and purpose in which you have met. [Great applause.] The President, so long as he remains in power, has no thought of departing from the traditions bequeathed us by the great soldiers and statesmen of our early history, which have been strictly followed during the last seven years. We shall continue to advocate and to carry into effect, as far as practicable, the principle of the arbitration of such questions as may not be settled through diplomatic negotiations. We have already done much in this direction; we shall hope to do much more. The President is now considering the negotiation of treaties of arbitration with such of the European powers as desire them, and hopes to lay them before the Senate next winter. [Applause.] And finally, the President only a few days ago promised, in response to the request of the Interparliamentary Union, to invite the nations to a second Conference at The Hague to continue the work of the Conference of 1899. [Applause.]

Unhappily we cannot foresee in the immediate future the cessation of wars upon the earth. We ought therefore to labor constantly for the mitigation of the horrors of war, especially to do what we can to lessen the sufferings of those who have no part in the struggle. This has been one of the most warmly cherished wishes of the last two Administrations. I make no apology for reading you a paragraph from the message which President Roosevelt sent to Congress last December:

> "There seems good ground for the belief that there has been a real growth among the civilized nations of a sentiment which will permit a gradual substitution of other methods than the method of war in the settlement of disputes. It is not pretended that as yet we are near a position in which it will be possible wholly to prevent war, or that a just regard for national interest and honor will in all cases permit of the settlement of international disputes by arbitration; but by a mixture of prudence and firmness with wisdom we think it is possible to do away with much of the provocation and excuse for war, and at least in many cases to substitute some other and more rational method for the settlement of disputes. The Hague Court offers so good an example of what can be done in the direction of such settlement that it should be encouraged in every way.
>
> "Further steps should be taken. In President McKinley's annual message of December 5, 1898, he made the following recommendation:
>
> "'The experiences of the last year bring forcibly home to us a sense of the burdens and the waste of war. We desire, in common with most civilized nations,

to reduce to the lowest possible point the damage sustained in time of war by peaceable trade and commerce. It is true we may suffer in such cases less than other communities, but all nations are damaged more or less by the state of uneasiness and apprehension into which an outbreak of hostilities throws the entire commercial world. It should be our object, therefore, to minimize, so far as practicable, this inevitable loss and disturbance. This purpose can probably best be accomplished by an international agreement to regard all private property at sea as exempt from capture or destruction by the forces of belligerent powers. The United States government has for many years advocated this humane and beneficent principle, and is now in a position to recommend it to other powers without the imputation of selfish motives. I therefore suggest for your consideration that the Executive be authorized to correspond with the governments of the principal maritime powers with a view of incorporating into the permanent law of civilized nations the principle of the exemption of all private property at sea, not contraband of war, from capture or destruction by belligerent powers.' "

The President urged this beneficent scheme with an earnestness which gained the willing attention of Congress, already predisposed to it in spirit, and on the 28th of April of this year he was able to approve a joint resolution of both Houses recommending that the "President endeavor to bring about an understanding among the principal maritime powers with a view of incorporating into the permanent law of civilized nations the principle of the exemption of all private property at sea, not contraband of war, from capture or destruction by belligerents."

It has not been thought advisable by the President during the last summer to call the attention of the powers to a project which would necessarily be regarded by two of them, and possibly by others, with reference to its bearing upon the deplorable conflict now raging in the Far East. But as we earnestly pray that the return of peace may not be long delayed between the two nations, to both of which we are bound by so many historic ties, we may confidently look forward at no distant day to inviting the attention of the nations to this matter, and we hope we may have the powerful influence of this great organization in gaining their adherence. [Applause.]

The time allotted to me is at an end. I can only bid you Godspeed in your work. The task you have proposed to yourselves and the purpose to which you are devoted have won the praise of earth and the blessing of heaven since the morning of time. The noblest of all the beatitudes is the consecration promised the peacemakers. Even if in our time we may not win the wreath of olive, even if we may not hear the golden clamor of the trumpets celebrating the reign of universal and enduring peace, it is something to have desired it, to have worked for it in the measure of our forces. And if you now reap no visible guerdon of your labors, the peace of God that passes understanding will be your all-sufficient reward. [Great applause.]

The Chairman: Secretary Hay has alluded in terms so beautiful and fitting to the solemn coincidence by which we are meeting here to-day at the same hour in which at the heart of the Commonwealth is passing the funeral of our greatest Massachusetts public man that no further word upon that subject is needed. The fact of this solemn coincidence makes the presence of our Governor here impossible. He has written us this word:

> "Much to my regret I find that it will not be possible for me to extend the welcome of the Commonwealth at Tremont Temple on Monday afternoon. Senator Hoar's funeral is to occur at half past two on that day at Worcester, and I must of course be there.
>
> "With much regret, and trusting that you will explain the reason for my absence, I remain,
>
> "Yours sincerely,
>
> (Signed) JOHN L. BATES."

But the Commonwealth is not without representation. We shall hear in her behalf from the President of the Massachusetts Senate. There is a famous word by our great Boston poet, Dr. Holmes, which is almost always misquoted. We hear it said, and ascribed to him, that "Boston is the hub of the universe." Dr. Holmes was much more narrow about the hub, and much more explicit about the circumference. His word was this: "Boston State House is the hub of the solar system." [Laughter.] The corner-stone of Boston's State House was laid by Samuel Adams, and before he laid it he had the honor and the high distinction, which is often forgotten, of having addressed a memorial to Congress in behalf of the Legislature of Massachusetts, asking Congress to take some steps in concert with the other nations to bring about arbitration as the means of settling international disputes.

From the time when Samuel Adams, our great Governor, laid the cornerstone of the Boston State House our cause has never failed of warm friends there, and it is a pleasure that we are to hear the greetings of the State House and the Commonwealth from the lips of the President of the Massachusetts Senate, Hon. George R. Jones.

REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE R. JONES.

Mr. President and Members of the International Peace Congress: His Excellency, the Governor, having been called away, as the presiding officer has said, in the performance of a sad duty, it has devolved upon me to represent him here and to extend the greetings of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to this distinguished gathering.

I cannot forbear remarking upon the strange and the sad coincidence which has been alluded to both by the presiding officer and by Secretary Hay, that at the very moment when the last eulogy is being pronounced over the mortal remains of our beloved senior Senator, this Congress is engaged in its opening deliberations. For a generation he has stood in the halls of Congress as the representative of a pure and enlightened statesmanship, a servant not only of his beloved Massachusetts, but of the nation as well. With an instinctive dislike for war, and a natural abhorrence of all its attendant woe and evil, both in private and in national affairs his voice and influence have ever been for peace when consistent with honor. His memory is now enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen, and the name of George F. Hoar will take its place with those of Adams and Hancock and Warren, of Webster and Choate, of Garrison and Phillips, of Sumner and of Wilson.

I know of no better place for a meeting of this character than on the soil of Massachusetts and in the midst of her people. The history of our State is a gradual unfolding and development of high and enlightened ideals both in civic and in national affairs, and the men who have made Massachusetts great, and whose names are written with letters of light upon the pages of her history, are men who have been representative of those high ideals.

Standing therefore here as representing the people of this grand old Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I bid you in their name a most cordial welcome and greeting, with a wish that the result of the deliberations of this Congress may be such that the influence of its action will be universal, world-wide and lasting. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: It is with special gratitude that we remember in welcoming you here to the thirteenth International Peace Congress, the first Peace Congress which has been held in Boston, that Boston was the cradle of the first important Peace Society, and that the leaders of our municipal administration have again and again from the beginning been distinguished representatives of this great cause. It was he whom we are fond of naming the great Mayor — Josiah Quincy — who in the Old South Meeting House, before the Peace Society, delivered the oration, hearing which the boy Charles Sumner dedicated himself to this great cause for life.

The Mayor of Boston to-day is no less a lover of the great cause of peace than was the great Mayor, Josiah Quincy. [Applause.] And in introducing him I wish to say, and say in behalf of our Committee, that no one from the beginning of the preparations for this enterprise has been of greater service to us. When we wavered as to the right to invite you here, it was his strong word assuring us of the backing of the city which enabled us to go confidently into the councils which resulted in the choice of Boston as the place of this Congress. [Applause.] And from then to now he has been our friend and helper. It is with gratitude and satisfaction that I call upon Hon. Patrick A. Collins to welcome you in behalf of the City of Boston. [Great applause.]

REMARKS OF HON. PATRICK A. COLLINS, MAYOR OF BOSTON.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen: I count it one of the choice honors of my magistracy to be associated even so slightly with this great gathering and this great movement. It needs no official word to give you the welcome of Boston. Here was the cradle of the movement; here was the peace movement nurtured, and here is its genuine home.

And so you are welcome to all our hearts, — our hearts and our homes. I echo what the Secretary of State in his most scholarly and beautiful address has stated, and the welcome of the Commonwealth,— which is all embracing, because Boston is a portion of it, — trusting that your coming together here shall be profitable for the good of the cause which I also have in my inmost heart. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: At the first regular meeting of the Congress to-morrow morning every nation represented will make response by some chosen one of its delegates; to-day the greetings of our national state and city governments will be responded to simply by two chosen delegates.

It has been said again and again that the churches have been peculiarly derelict in the cause of peace, and have not lived up to their high calling. Many of the clergy have, indeed, been derelict; but it is false to say that the churches have been worse than others. On the whole they have been far better, I believe. But whoever among clergymen have sinned, there is one bishop of the Church of England to whose charge that sin cannot be laid. In these last days when wars have been going on which to so many of us have seemed criminal, and have found apologists in high places in the church, the voice of Bishop Percival of Hereford has been heard steadily calling the Church of England and the churches of the world up to their high distinction. [Applause.]

We rejoice to have with us to-day, and I rejoice in being able to call upon as the first to respond to these greetings, Dr. John Percival, the Bishop of Hereford. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF THE RT. REV. JOHN PERCIVAL, D. D., BISHOP OF HEREFORD, ENGLAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As you have just heard, I have the high and unexpected privilege of endeavoring to express to you on behalf of the delegates from a distance to this Congress our profound sense of gratitude for all the kindness and the hospitality which we are receiving.

We are a somewhat — I had almost said a somewhat heterogeneous company that come to you. No, we are not heterogeneous, but we come from very various quarters of the world, and we have lived in very different circumstances. I cannot claim to represent my Church of England in the older world, but I do venture to say that there is no member of that Church who, if he ever hears of your generous reception of us, will not be grateful for it.

We are come from various parts of Europe, and not from Europe only. You have two or three representatives from that stricken region of Armenia, two of them archbishops, I think, and we could hardly have any persons amongst us whose very presence would be a stronger appeal than that of these distinguished Armenians to this great nation to do what can be done for peace, so marred in that region. [Applause.]

Well then, we thank you for your kind welcome, but one and all we thank you much more for the words in which that welcome has been expressed by your Chairman, and in particular in the noble address of Mr. Secretary Hay. When I think of that address I feel that Mr. Hay's presence to-day gives a new character to these peace gatherings. [Applause.]

I feel more grateful still that this address has been given to us by Mr. Hay himself, on his own behalf, as well as on behalf of the President of this great Republic. I feel the value of it because Mr. Secretary Hay is well known in Europe, and greatly respected and honored there. [Applause.] I venture to think that his words, great as they are, will be far more valued in Europe because they were spoken as his words. For you know, my friends, we are all apt to put greater stress upon personal example than upon any words. Therefore I have the feeling that this movement has made a great step forward to-day, for this address to which we have been listening will be read all over the world, and it will make its impression in cabinets and in chancelleries where no words of most of us would be listened to at all. [Applause.]

You know, my friends, that we who have been laboring hitherto in the cause of peace have not always been thought to be very influential persons. For my own part, I sometimes feel that some of my friends say that "this excellent bishop is of the nature of a crank." [Laughter.] Well, my friends, every one who gives up his life to the battle for some great principles not popular in all quarters is liable to criticism of that kind. I think it possible that the prophet Isaiah was liable to it in Jerusalem [laughter], and many another.

With regard to this peace movement we are happily come to a time of change, as I believe. We have to thank the Czar of all the Russias — and I for my part thank him with a grateful heart — for his rescript, because, coming from him as it did, he thus helped, as very few men on earth could help, to bring this question of peace and arbitration and disarmament within the region of practical politics — for discussion, at any rate. And now we have the Secretary of State of your republic, your most intelligent and practical nation, coming amongst us today, and his coming is a sort of earnest that these principles are to have practical application in the time to come such as never before. [Applause.]

Well, ladies and gentlemen, having said thus much I should not be inclined to say anything on the general principles for which we are working. Indeed, after the noble address of Mr. Hay I have felt that the best speech which I could make on the subject would be just the speech which, as some of you may know, was made by a candidate for parliamentary honors in the city of Bristol, which was my home for many years. He was the colleague of Mr. Edmund

Burke, and Mr. Burke having spoken to the electors of Bristol, the other gentlemen being called upon to speak after him made this his speech: "I say ditto to Mr. Burke." [Laughter.] So we members of this Congress, from whatever quarter we come, one and all are prepared to say ditto to Mr. Hay. [Applause.]

There is perhaps one word which Mr. Secretary Hay could hardly say, and which can be said very easily by an outsider like myself, and that is, that those of us who are striving and hoping for arbitration, peace and disarmament among the powers of the world, are all looking to the United States to take the lead in the matter. Our hope is fixed on the international policy of the United States in the years to come. You have one of the greatest opportunities of history, and there is no other country which can compare for a moment with yours in regard to the power which you have to help forward this great movement.

I think as you listened, ladies and gentlemen, you could not but have marked what a difference, what a fundamental difference, there is between the noble words of Mr. Hay and the ordinary, shall I say hypocrisies, of international diplomacy. In our European diplomacy, as I follow it, sometimes I am inclined to say that the great nations of Europe seem to believe in an entirely wrong theory of life. Their theory of life sometimes seems to me what we might call the menagerie theory. But Mr. Hay's theory of life is that human society is not a menagerie, but a brotherhood and a family. [Applause.] And this is what we have to do, to inspire all men everywhere with the right theory of life. We are very thankful that the world is advancing in this respect, if not by leaps and bounds, yet steadily and never to go back again.

We have to sweep away out of civilized society certain wrong notions about dominance. There is first of all that inveterate idea of religious dominance. How it has desolated the earth with religious wars! We thank God that the time has come when, as we believe, there will be no more wars of religion. [Applause.] Then, again, how the earth has been desolated by the belief in dynastic dominance, the predominance of monarchies and families and privileged classes! The day of this dominance also is passing by. [Applause.] And, finally, we have to get rid — it will be long before the hope is consummated — but we have to get rid, my friends, of the idea of national dominance. The rule of our life in the future will be, I trust, not national, revolutionary and competitive, but national and international coöperation. [Applause.]

Without going further, ladies and gentlemen, those of us who have come from far and near tender to you our very grateful thanks for the welcome you have given us. We shall go away feeling that this Congress in Boston has been a memorable moment in history, and may the results of it be blessed in the time to come. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: It is an auspicious coincidence which brings to the United States at the same time the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union and that of the International Peace Congress. There is one eminent representative of the cause who came to America for both meetings, Mr. John Lund, long member of the Norwegian Parliament and for many years its president. He has been attending the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at St. Louis, and is here with us for the Peace Congress. I have pleasure in calling upon Mr. John Lund. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF MR. JOHN LUND.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen; I well know that the honor you confer upon me to-day in asking of me a few words is in behalf of the Committee I have the privilege of representing, the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, and in honor of one of the great benefactors of humanity, Mr. Alfred Nobel, by whom the organization was shaped.

The history of the enemy that we are fighting — war — is older than all authentic history. So far as concerns the nations whose history we can trace, their stories of war go far back into legendary times. But in our time the art of war, the art of killing men, has reached its greatest height. Although Europe in general has had peace for about a generation, nevertheless military expenditure has increased to an enormous extent, due to the system of "the armed peace."

The material cost and losses are only a part of the evils. What demoralization does not war and the entire war system bring about? What scandals are not brought to light from the military life of the various great countries of the world, from circles whose position and education should make them pioneers in many domains? But the idleness and dissipation of military life coarsen and stupefy them, and our age and civilization are disgraced in consequence.

In time of peace people are blinded by the bright side of the medal — the grand parades, the stalwart men in their fine uniforms, the electrifying music of the bands. They then forget the shady side, the dark night picture, the slaughter of thousands upon thousands of the best men in the vigor of their age, the wounds and mutilations, the boundless sorrow and distress of the homes, the economic misery and the moral ruin.

If we inquire what blessings war really brings, I think when all is summed up we shall have to grant that war really only brings about stagnation and retrogression.

"War makes heroes," it is said; but would not the very men who on the battlefield distinguished themselves by courage and contempt of death, in the service of peace, in many realms of life also find occasion and opportunity to display these characteristics with quite as much honor to themselves and to the blessing of humanity? How many an unrecorded deed is done in ordinary life by sailor, by fisherman, by common laborer, by scientist, etc., often under circumstances the very reverse of inspiring; whilst on the battlefield there is so much at the moment to stimulate!

The history of our army, the army of peace, as an organization, is very short, although even from the days of our Peace Prince, nineteen hundred years ago, we have been taught to "love one another," and through the centuries many of his disciples have preached his evangel, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men."

Now and then a voice was lifted for the abolition of war, but it found no willing ear. Right down to the end of the eighteenth century there was scarcely any one who seriously believed that it would be possible within any measurable future to get war appreciably limited. It was reserved for the nineteenth century to take the first serious step in the abolition of war and the substitution for it of judicial settlement of the disputes that may arise between nations.

In the first ranks of our army I am glad to say that the United States has from the first (from the days of Channing and Elihu Burritt up to our time) taken a prominent place.

This is not the place for details. I shall only add that during the last fifteen years, through the organization and yearly meetings of the International Peace Congress and the Interparliamentary Union, the cause of peace has made good progress. These organizations were smiled at in the beginning by many within the governments of their respective countries. But this quickly altered, and five years ago the first International Peace Congress of the governments met at The Hague, where twenty-six countries in and out of Europe were represented.

As a member of the Interparliamentary Union, I have just recently had the great joy of hearing your President, Mr. Roosevelt, declare at the White House that he will be glad to accept the proposal of our Interparliamentary Union adopted at St. Louis, and that he will in the near future call a second International Governmental Peace Conference. [Applause.]

Now the three great powers, the people generally, the governments and the parliaments, have openly placed the cause of peace on their programs.

But there is still a fourth power — the press, whose hearty support for the cause is to be won. And, here again, this country has established a record. Time after time have we at the international congresses called upon the press to unite with us in our work, but in vain. But some months ago at the Press Congress in St. Louis, with the full support of your great statesman, Mr. John Hay [applause], whom we now also have the honor to welcome, and whose golden words for peace we have heard, the press placed the cause of peace on its program. I am convinced that the press of this country will hereafter prove a loyal and steady ally in our fight. [Applause.]

And last, but not least, in the ranks of our peace army we have a power, one of the strongest in the world; we have the women, the mothers, wives and sisters who work for our cause as one of the holiest on earth.

A new day is dawning. It is only a question of a few years more or less. Man's life is short, the life of nations long. Sooner or later the peace army shall bring the victory home. [Applause.]

And now allow me to say some private words. I have been present at ten international congresses and I have seen many receptions, but I will say that a reception which has made a greater impression upon me than the kind reception you have given us yesterday and to-day I have never experienced. [Applause.]

After the singing of a hymn the meeting closed.

Monday afternoon, from 4 to 6 o'clock, a reception was given to the foreign delegates by the Twentieth Century Club at 2 Ashburton Place.

First Business Session.

Tuesday Morning, October 4, 10 A. M.

The first regular business session of the Congress was held on Tuesday morning, October 4, at 10 o'clock, in the auditorium of Tremont Temple.

EDWIN D. MEAD, Chairman of the Committee on Organization, called the meeting to order, and said:

In behalf of the American Committee of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, I welcome you to this gathering. I congratulate you and congratulate ourselves upon the auspicious place of our meeting. It was in the old Tremont Theatre, which stood where Tremont Temple now stands, that Elihu Burritt, the inspirer of the great Peace Congresses half a century ago, gave, in 1841, his first address upon Universal Peace. It was in Tremont Temple that Charles Sumner, four years later, gave his noble oration upon the "True Grandeur of Nations"; and in Park Street Church yonder, where one of the mass meetings of this evening and many of our meetings this week will be held, he gave a few years afterwards that yet greater address upon "The War System of Nations." It was in Tremont Temple that were held in 1899, largely inspired by our veteran peace worker, Edward Everett Hale, the principal American meetings to promote interest in the Hague Conference. It was in Tremont Temple, we here in Boston still gratefully remember, that at the meeting of the International Congregational Council later in that same year, when the iniquitous wars in the Transvaal and the Philippines were raging, and American apologists for the latter had striven on this platform to say all that could be said for war, that grand old English Christian, Alexander Mackennal, whom we hoped to have with us to-day, but whom God has taken home, cleared the air memorably by his lofty and eloquent assertion of the law of love.

The last half century has emphasized with terrible force the plea of Burritt for human brotherhood and the better organization of the world. Never did events lay more startling emphasis than to-day upon Sumner's arraignment of the wicked waste upon great navies and armies of the resources which should be applied to constructive purposes and the education and welfare of the people, and which, so applied, would quickly bring an end to war forever.

We do not forget here in America — be sure that none remember so constantly — that our own Republic, from which it was indeed your right not to expect it, has yielded in these days to the temptations to make herself also a great naval power, and has indulged the hoary old ambitions of commanding respect by force instead of by ideas and the neighborly hand. We acknowledge the justice of your warnings and reproaches. We do not resent them; we thank you for them. We thank you for reminding us, as you have done with such eloquence and feeling in the last two days, of the principles of the founders of our republic and the high duties of leadership in the path of peace and order which the republic by its history and position owes the world. If in the great temptations of our opulence and power some of us are in danger of forgetfulness and faithlessness, may the presence of so many of you here, from nations whose burdens and dangers are so much greater than ours, and who need the support of every influence of ours upon the right side and not the wrong side, help to call us back to our better selves! [Applause.]

But remember this: We no longer differ from you as we did in the days of Sumner and Burritt and Channing. Things are not as they were half a century ago. Conditions are rapidly becoming everywhere alike, and one nation can no longer keep much ahead of another. We stand or fall together. You have a right to ask us as you do to check the building of a great navy. We must say to you that the real way to help us is by such agitation at home as shall check the increase of your own. [Applause.] Your acts are temptations and provocations to us, as ours are to you. We will indeed cherish the hope that some great, chivalric nation may with magnificent abandon cast her whole armor into the abyss and rely confidently for protection upon the grandeur of that high act and attitude; but, while we hope for that, let us not build upon it, but work patiently together for gradual disarmament together.

While we thank you for your warnings, we thank you also for your generous recognition of our good deeds and our good purposes. Our President has recently proudly and properly claimed that the Hague Court was impotent until the government of the United States made it a reality. It is not alone his word; it is the warm word also of Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant, the honored leader of the arbitration movement in the French Assembly. [Applause.] Our President has assured you that he will take steps for the calling of a second Hague Conference, to push on the work which the first could not fully achieve. I believe that he will do it. [Applause.] Of this be sure — that the American people are waking up. They will declare with power to-morrow that all playing with the fire of militarism in this republic must forever cease; that if one existing party does not stop it, then its mandate will go to another; and our history teaches us well how quickly sometimes, when there is need of it, great new parties are born in America, and become triumphant.

Men tell us war will cease in this world and our dreams come true only with the millennium. I pity men who have such poor notions of the millennium. [Applause.] The evils which we fight are among the grossest and most barbarous of evils. They befit only the early, the elementary and low stages of civilization. Our effort is to clean the Augean stables. Horrors and wickedness such as those going on at this hour in Asia ought to be so far behind as not even to be mentioned among civilized men. Toleration of war in this twentieth century after Christ is like setting up the Ten Commandments on the walls of Christian churches, warning presumedly decent Christians not to steal or kill or commit adultery. Put the Beatitudes on the walls of your churches! It is only when we have done forever with such savage and gross forms of wrong as war that we shall be in a position to make a first fair, decent start for the millennium. [Applause.]

One hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson was President of the United States. You remember and we remember what the policies of peace and international fraternity were to which he called the new American Republic. Help us in his republic, in this centennial time, to be true to his truth. This is a time of eloquent anniversaries. The year is the centennial in Germany of the death of the great author of "Eternal Peace." It is the centennial of the birth in England of Richard Cobden. The great apostolic succession is never broken, and the apostles are multiplying to-day as never before. To-morrow the vision and devotion of Kant and Cobden and Victor Hugo and Sumner shall be those of every thoughtful German and Englishman and Frenchman and American. [Applause.]

Mr. Mead: It is in order for us next to perfect the organization of this Congress, and according to usage the Committee on Organization proposes for President of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, Hon. Robert Treat Paine of Boston, President of the American Peace Society, and for Secretary, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, the Secretary of the American Peace Society.

Mr. Paine and Dr. Trueblood were unanimously elected President and Secretary, respectively, and Mr. Paine thereupon took the chair, and spoke as follows:

OPENING ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE.

Mr. Mead, Ladies and Gentlemen: I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this great honor. It is the proudest moment of my life. [Applause.] I wish I were more competent to fulfill its great duties.

I congratulate you on meeting in full numbers after crossing the stormy Atlantic, in this, to many of you, distant city. I recall — and you know even better than I — that this is the Thirteenth International Peace Congress. You have met in Paris and London and Rome and other cities. We are delighted to welcome you here in the old Puritan city of Boston. I hope that you will enjoy it, and that you will visit the scenes where blood has been shed. A few minutes walk from here the Revolutionary War began in the shedding of blood at the head of State Street. In the Old South Church you will find the place where the Revolutionary War was begun in the stirring of men's souls and preparing them for action. Just across the Bay you will see Bunker Hill Monument, which Webster said was visible to three hundred thousand citizens of Massachusetts. To-day we can easily add a million to that number. And after you have visited these scenes of warfare and of blood, come back to this peaceful temple to help us, the citizens of Boston and of Massachusetts and of the United States, pledge ourselves and our country to this high cause of peace and arbitration among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

We are delighted, therefore, to welcome you, ladies and gentlemen, who have come so far to work in this great cause. We shall do all we can to make your stay in Boston delightful. Call upon us to aid you in any way in our power.

And now the first thought,— if I may speak frankly and without reserve,— the first thought that comes into my mind is that we should be bold enough to utter the conviction that we are privileged to work in the *greatest* cause now before the world. [Applause.] This cause is to be advanced in no small degree by our recognizing our duty, our privilege, to proclaim to the world this great fact — that this cause of peace among the nations is not a mere iridescent dream, but is making more progress than any other great cause before the world. [Applause.]

Just at this moment of course we are disheartened. We are all saddened at the terrible condition of things on the other side of the world. This bloody, awful, unspeakable war, whose horrors we cannot adequately conceive, between two great nations reckless of blood and suffering, may well give us pause. But the earthquake and the tornado do not last always; they are not the normal conditions of life. They come mysteriously by permission of Providence, but presently they pass and the sunshine and the calm return. Even so we look forward with confidence to no distant day when these sad conditions shall be past. We look forward to seeing this world in a permanent peace which we can rejoice that it is our privilege to aid and to promote.

The next thought I wish to present to you, which I love to recall to my own mind, is the fact that the rivalry of nations, which heretofore has been directed to war and greed and conquest, is now turning into a nobler channel. [Applause.] Here is the great hope, it seems to me, in the near future. It was a great pleasure to me a few years ago to hear this truth proclaimed before the graduating students at the neighboring university of Harvard — that the object of education is no longer the salvation of the individual, either in this world or the next, but the advancement of mankind. Here surely was a magnificent altruistic ideal for education. We are holding up before the nations of the world, they are becoming conscious themselves, that there is a magnificent ideal in the rivalry of nations in mutual helpfulness, in aiming to promote the welfare not only of themselves, but of each other and of the whole world.

So that when pessimists greet us, as they do at every corner, with cynical sneers at our cause, at the progress which they belittle, we are entitled to turn upon them with exultation, and to point to the wonderful progress which this cause has made in these recent years.

It is idle to expect a cause like this to show its progress from day to day, but I invite you, ladies and gentlemen of this Peace Congress, you who have been devoted to it for these thirteen years, to recall the condition of things in the world thirteen years ago. I challenge our detractors to cast a just, historic eye back upon the condition of things thirteen years ago, and then truthfully to regard the condition of the world to-day, without conceding our claim that this cause has made greater progress in the last thirteen years than any other great cause before the world. Now if that be so, we are moving forward to victory, and the progress that we have made, that this cause has made, in these recent years, is a sign that it will keep moving on, conquering and to conquer.

It was about fourteen years ago that the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Blaine, issued a circular letter, pursuant to the resolve of the American Congress, inviting all nations with whom the United States had diplomatic relations to enter into treaties of arbitration. It was my privilege in 1891 to call upon the American Ambassador at Paris, Mr. Whitelaw Reid, and inquire what result had followed from that communication to France. His reply was that it had been forwarded, acknowledged, and he expected nothing more from it. I made a similar inquiry of the United States Minister at London, and received a similar reply. No hope was entertained that a communication inviting relations of arbitration would produce results. Well, now, it is impossible to conceive that condition of things in 1891 as happening to-day. The most striking event in the diplomatic world in the last year or two has been the wonderful movement throughout Western Europe, leading the nations there one after another in rapid sequence to enter into treaties of obligatory arbitration.

It is a great pleasure to mention the fact that England and France began this movement by a treaty promoted by a great popular uprising throughout those two great nations, calling upon their governments to bind themselves by a treaty, for a limited period of years, to be sure, in permanent relations of peace. And the step which they took has been followed by many other nations, too many for me at this moment to enumerate. Our friends in this country will permit me to say — I think they will agree with me when I say — that it is a grief to us that the movement which we attempted in that direction by a treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain eight years ago failed by only four votes of the needed two-thirds of our United States Senate. And so we lost the honor of leading in that great movement. One of our ardent hopes at present is strengthened by that splendid spectacle of yesterday afternoon, when the Secretary of State,— who perhaps my friends from abroad will permit, and our American friends will wish, me to say stands as the first statesman in the world [applause],— John

Hay, came here to this platform and said that our government and the President look forward to consummating at an early date similar treaties of obligatory arbitration with the nations of the world.

And so, my friends, we are on the conquering path; we are moving forward, and the world is going to reap the benefit of the devotion and the wisdom and the consecration which you, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Congress, have put into this movement in these last thirteen years.

I hope we shall be able to help somewhat here in our beloved Boston and America. We hope that as a result of the influences that may go out of these meetings we shall consummate a treaty of arbitration between America and Great Britain, between America and France, between America and Germany, and so on, until the United States has bound itself under permanent ties of obligatory arbitration with all the civilized countries of the world. [Applause.]

One other great cause you will allow me to allude to. We hope that we may have before many years, as the next great consummation following the Hague Court,— which stands as the first step in binding the nations of the world together,— a congress, a congress of nations, a regular, stated, international congress. [Applause.]

Do not understand us to ask that this congress shall at first be clothed with power. The time is not yet ripe when a congress can meet with power to legislate for the world. It is to be advisory. It will make its recommendations; it will gather various nations together into a common whole; it will bring them into sympathetic relations of counsel and coöperation; it will recommend. This is the next great thing for which we must labor, the stated international congress.

I must not detain you longer. I thank you from my heart for the honor you have done me. [Applause.]

The Chairman: You will now have the pleasure of listening to responses from representatives of various nations who have honored us with their presence. The first speaker will be a representative from Belgium, Mr. Houzeau de Lehaie, a member of the Belgian Senate, who was President of the Sixth International Peace Congress, held at Antwerp in 1894.

RESPONSE OF MR. HOUZEAU DE LEHAIE.

SPOKEN IN FRENCH AND INTERPRETED BY MR. ADOLPHE SMITH.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am proud to be the first among the foreign delegates to rise to thank the United States in general, the city of Boston and the American Peace Society in particular, for the very cordial welcome you have given to all the foreigners who are present, and the fraternal manner in which you have received us in your midst.

I have been attending the Interparliamentary Conference at St.

Louis, and that has given me an opportunity of seeing not only the immensity of your country, so far as geographical extent is concerned, but the marvelous progress and development achieved here in so very short a time.

I stand in this respect in about the greatest contrast to you, for I am a representative of one of the very smallest countries in the world, Belgium. But if Belgium is small, it has yet suffered much by being made the fighting ground of the European nations. It has in the past been annexed by France, it has been annexed by Spain, and by other countries, but now we have enjoyed three-quarters of a century of independent existence. We sincerely hope that in the future the nations will arbitrate all their difficulties instead of fighting over them, because Belgium does not want to be the fighting ground of Europe any more, or be annexed by any other people. [Laughter and applause.]

Speaking in English, Mr. Houzeau de Lehaie further said:

Those who are familiar with the sights of war are not those who make wars; they send others into the battlefields, and rest idly at home; they send others to be crushed and slain on battlefields, and they spend with a light heart lots of money for the war which they do not pay themselves; they do not suffer the miseries the poor people endure.

Will it be long ere in America the people take into their own hands their own affairs? Your forty-five states live in peace and concord; when will it be the same with the European nations? When will they say to their rulers, "Stop your wars and the building of armaments; we want men to walk in peace? [Applause.] Let us, instead of fighting and murdering for your sole benefit, contend by mind and heart to be more useful to mankind." [Applause.]

The last century has seen the consolidation and progress of the United States of America; let us hope that this century will see the establishment of the United States of Europe, and that the next will bring the unification of the wide world in justice, liberty and peace. [Great applause]

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now have the pleasure of hearing from Prof. Theodore Ruyssen of Aix, President of the *Association de la Paix pa.· le Droit*, who will respond for France.

RESPONSE OF PROF. THEODORE RUYSSEN.

DELIVERED IN FRENCH AND INTERPRETED BY MR. ADOLPHE SMITH.

I am very proud to speak on behalf of France, though I much regret the absence of those who are older than I in the movement. I beg you to believe that such workers do exist in the peace movement in France, and I appeal to all Americans who have attended the International Congresses in Europe to bear me witness that Frederic Passy [applause], though eighty years old and nearly blind, has displayed at these Congresses all the fire and energy of youth. The young men cannot rival him in enthusiasm; indeed, the young men of Europe who advocate the cause of peace are the children, intellectually speaking, of their elder, Frederic Passy. [Applause.]

I regret that the French are such bad travelers. I regret that they seem to think so little is to be learned outside of their own country, and I feel that they have lost immensely — those who might have come here and have not done so.

The Frenchman in America feels himself quite at home; he feels here that he has brought with him a little of his own country; he sees on all sides the traces of French history. He recognizes the French names of many of your towns, of many of your rivers, of many of your squares and streets; it is St. Louis or Louisville, or it is Lafayette or some other French name that greets him at every turn.

I may remind you that the history of France and the history of the United States of America present a unique feature in the history of the world, because between those two nations, France and the United States, there has not been a single drop of blood spilt in the whole of their mutual history. [Great applause.] There are talks and rumors of war; some even have gone so far as to suggest the possibility of war between the United States and Germany (which heaven forbid!), but never has there been the slightest rumor of war between the United States and France, and never could such a war occur.

I bring to you good news of the development of the peace movement in France. The government has been affected by it; public opinion has been awakened by it. Recently a violent jingo imperialist party in France tried to bring on a war; they got up a scare in regard to some complication on the Algerian-Morocco frontier, and they tried to drag France into war. Well, the Socialist Party of France and the Peace Party of France, acting independently, made such a movement and agitation in the country that the jingo and imperialist party was defeated and pushed aside, and no war occurred. [Applause.]

The peace societies held a national arbitration congress at Toulouse a year and a half ago, and it was attended by only about fifty delegates; more recently another national peace congress was held, and it was attended by six hundred delegates. [Applause.] And not only has this movement resulted in the treaty between England and France, but in treaties with four other nations as well, so that the ideal has become the reality in very many respects.

We have come here to learn from a good example. We have noticed that everything in this country is big; the towns are large, the expanse of country large, the rivers are immense, and even your trees are gigantic. I hope that your peace movement will be correspondingly large, and even bigger than they all. [Great applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now have the pleasure of hearing from Germany, from one of the leaders there, wise and strong and honored, Dr. Adolf Richter of Pforzheim, President of the German Peace Society, who was president of the Eighth International Peace Congress held at Hamburg in 1897. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF DR. ADOLF RICHTER.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am afraid I will not be able to express in a few words all I am feeling in this solemn moment. I will begin by presenting to you a hearty greeting from your German friends, the members of the German Peace Society, who are sending you their best wishes for the success of the labors of this Congress. We know very well that the American Peace Society, with the societies out of which it was formed, is the mother of the modern peace movement, and so we are here at the very cradle of it. From here the peace movement spread all over the world, and in your country lived many of the illustrious peace workers, whose names we see hung around this hall. We are always looking to you as a luminous example to be imitated, and, if possible, to be equaled.

The first time I came over to your country, in 1893, the only German delegate to the Chicago Peace Congress, I was so heartily welcomed that I really felt quite at home. Now when I come here again with about a half a dozen friends, we are experiencing the same, and even greater, hospitality than I found on my first visit.

We give you our hearty thanks for the kind welcome, and we are also very much indebted to Secretary Hay, representing the United States government, and to your Governor and Mayor, for the kind and encouraging words we heard in this hall yesterday.

If we think that the peace movement is going on but slowly, if we see that there are still places in the world where the gun and the sword are the rulers and decide disputes between nations, we ought not to lose our courage. [Applause.] We must remember that we are fighting against prejudices inveterate for centuries. We must reflect that the natural evolution of human nature and of human culture is only a slow one, and has been so in all time. Hitherto, you know, war has generally been looked upon as a glorious thing; we peace people hope that the time will come when war will be looked upon as a great wrong and even as a sin. [Applause.]

The most of our work is still to be done. The German Peace Society is one of the newest. It was founded in 1892, and at the present time we have in our ranks about thirty thousand members, in more than seventy different places. [Applause.] We must win public opinion by demonstrations, and we must also win the coming generation by education. [Applause.]

I hope this Congress will be a good step forward in the right way, toward the various ideals we aim at. So let us work together, each according to the measure of his strength doing his duty, and we shall bring the work to a good end. [Applause.]

The Chairman: If I may say a private word to the Americans here present, we will now in imagination assume the ancient rôle of wayward and wandering children, and we will hear from the old mother country. We shall now listen to a representative of Great Britain, Alderman Thomas Snape, ex-member of Parliament, and President of the Liverpool Peace Society. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF ALDERMAN THOMAS SNAPE.

Mr. Paine, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is with mingled feelings that I have taken this position to-day and acceded to the request of my colleagues to respond for them. I am here with reluctance. I would that some one gifted with greater powers of speech might have done to the welcome which you have extended to us the justice which it deserves. On the other hand, it is always a pleasure to me to be taking part in a congress or a movement for the promotion of peace, and it is an especial pleasure to be doing so in this great city of Boston. [Applause.]

I come from another great seaport city. We are very near together, Liverpool and Boston. [Applause.] The steamers are crossing every week. We see some of your people over with us; you see some of our citizens here with you. On account of our near neighborship and the intimacy of our commercial relations, my pleasure is heightened in being permitted to take part in this great gathering.

There is perhaps just this element of fitness in my occupancy of the position, that I can claim seniority of service in this cause over any other member of the British delegation who is present. It was, I think, in the year 1860 that I connected myself with the society of which I have been for many years president; and a large portion of my public life, so far as I could withdraw it from my own business affairs, has been occupied in the endeavor to give some effect to the views of those who think that international peace is a practicable and an attainable measure.

In the early days of my connection with this movement we were, comparatively speaking, a small and uninfluential body. We were held up to contumely; we were scoffed at as "peace-at-any-price" men; we were regarded as dreamers and visionaries. Now how these things have changed! Possibly no one present has attended as many — certainly none has attended more — international congresses for the promotion of peace than have I, and one of my earliest recollections in connection therewith is being present at a conference that was held at The Hague in the 70's. It was a Conference of the Association for the Reform and Codification of International Law, an association originated by one of your countrymen, a predecessor of my friend Dr. Trueblood, — Dr. Miles, a former secretary of the American Peace Society. [Applause.] He had come to the conclusion that as there was no law by which the court that decided upon the Alabama difficulty could reach a decision, there ought to be a reform and codification of international law in order that future courts might have some basis to found their judgments upon. As you know, the law had to be created for that Alabama decision. That association, though under another name (the International Law Association), still exists, and is worthily represented at this Congress by my friend Mr. Alexander. At that conference to which I am referring there was present one American whom I single out for special mention, the Hon. Dudley Field. There was also present Henry Richard, whose name you have rightly placed among the honored names that surround this hall; and there was also there an eminent Frenchman and a very distinguished German.

Every one of these, I am afraid, has now passed away, but they have left their influence behind, and the congresses have been going on and multiplying not only in number, but in influence. We had at Hamburg, I think, the largest peace congress I had ever attended up to that time; we had at Rouen last year a meeting equal in numbers and enthusiasm to that at Hamburg, but nowhere have we had, in any of the numerous congresses I have attended, such a welcome and such a support as you have given us in your great and beautiful city. [Applause.]

I rejoice, therefore, to respond on behalf of my countrymen to your welcome. I had the pleasure of being in Boston on a former visit thirteen years ago, and of making the personal acquaintance of your eminent poet, John Greenleaf Whittier. I also had the pleasure of meeting Mr. James Russell Lowell and Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes on our own shores. You may imagine, after having had the pleasure and the honor of meeting three such men, citizens of your land, how delightful it is for me to find myself in your midst again.

Passing from these reminiscences, I just want to say how these congresses are growing, as I have just said, not only in point of numbers, but in influence. Instead of being now regarded as dreamers, we are looked upon as practical men. In these days even kings are taking notice of us and presidents receive us, as your President received several of us at the White House last Saturday week, and gave to us one of the most gratifying and important speeches that any man in any country has ever delivered. [Applause.] I understand that Secretary Hay occupies the position in your country that the Secretary of Foreign Affairs holds in our own, and to have the Secretary of Foreign Affairs in our country coming to one of our congresses would be a most wonderful thing. When we have another peace congress in England not only the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, but also the Prime Minister, will be reminded of the precedent that the Hon. John Hay has set. [Applause.]

Let me make one reference to a previous congress in which I participated in your country. It was held in Washington the year that I visited Boston. It was a great conference, but was held for a somewhat different purpose to this one, and I had been honored by the request to read a paper on international arbitration. President

Harrison had declared his intention to be present, and he came and made a speech, sympathetic, no doubt, with arbitration, but with qualifications. But the speech of your present President, not because he differs in other ways, but because of the present movement, was given to us without qualification last Saturday week.

In those days we talked of a treaty between America and England, and there had also been an attempt to make a treaty between all the countries on this continent. None of those things have yet come to pass; but before another peace congress is held on American soil, I venture to say both those things will have been accomplished. [Applause.] I hold with your great writer Emerson that universal peace, although utopian, as some men may say, is as sure to come as the prevalence of civilization over barbarism.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now have the pleasure of hearing a representative from Italy, Signor E. T. Moneta, founder and president of the Lombard Peace Society at Milan, editor for thirty years of the most widely circulated paper in Italy, and now the editor of the semi-monthly magazine, *La Vita Internazionale.*

RESPONSE OF MR. E. T. MONETA.

SPOKEN IN FRENCH AND INTERPRETED BY MR. ADOLPHE SMITH.

I bring to you the homage of the Peace Societies of Italy. It is as an ancient soldier of Garibaldi that I render homage to the country of Washington. I am a member of the Peace Society because I was a soldier, because I have fought and seen what war is like from personal experience. It was on the battlefield that I pledged myself to the cause of peace. [Applause.]

I accepted gladly the mission to represent the Italian peace workers at this Congress, for I had the ambition to see this great country, the country which is the El Dorado for youth and ambition. You have here a fertile soil, the largest of factories, the most busy of industries and the best of opportunities; you have even some of the best of millionaires [laughter], because if all the millionaires were like Mr. Carnegie there would soon be no more war. Then you have ladies, ladies who have known how to conquer the hearts of the oldest aristocracy of Europe. [Laughter.] Your products invade the old world, and you have phenomenal wealth. I plead for the poor; the poor cannot buy, but they have to live, and to them you owe a duty; and to the poorer nations of the world the richer Republic of America owes its duty. [Applause.]

A British statesman said once: "Woe to the weak, to the small peoples." This is against all the principles of justice. Small and great, rich and poor, have their rights, and it is our duty to defend those rights. [Applause.] It is your duty especially, because you here are not the *subjects* of a Republic, you are the *sovereigns* of a Republic, and you have the duty of a sovereign people.

In Italy we have now got a good peace organization. We publish a review, and we publish a yearly almanac on peace questions, which has a circulation of one hundred thousand. But at this Congress I am especially pleased to recall the fact that in our earlier days, when we had but few adherents and less money, when we were laboring under the very greatest difficulties to establish a peace movement in Italy, it was a daughter of Boston, Miss Cora Kennedy, who came forward and helped us, and finally left us the sum of thirty thousand francs, which was quite a colossal sum for a poor party and a poor country like Italy. With this help from a Boston lady the Italian Peace Party was born, and grew to its present strength, and it is anxious here to express to her memory and to her family the full gratitude of the people of Italy. [Applause.]

It is with a soul filled with admiration for this great Republic that I thank you for the reception. I hope that just as the confederation of the Swiss cantons serves as an example to all Europe, so will the federation of American States serve as an example to the whole world, and thus bring about the United States of all civilized peoples at no distant period. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN : We shall now have the pleasure of hearing from the representative of Monaco, L'Abbé Pichot, Vice-President of the Institute of Peace Studies.

L'Abbé Pichot spoke in French and furnished the following English translation of what he said ·

RESPONSE OF L'ABBE PICHOT.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am glad to bring to you the greetings of a very small state, of the principality of Monaco, but, notwithstanding its smallness, I am not embarrassed in fulfilling this mission. As this small territory had the honor, two years ago, to receive the peacemakers of the world and to be the place of meeting of the Eleventh Peace Congress, therefore it is not unknown to you. In addition, I recognize the fact that it is in America that I have now the honor to speak, America, the fatherland of equality. Here you live under a government of laws and not of men; here the influence of individuals and states is not valued by their riches and territorial extent, but by their real achievements.

I am in this beautiful republic of states, geometrical states, bounded simply by parallels of latitude and longitude, differing greatly in size and population, but all equal in rights, privileges and duties. I am in this great country where all the races fraternize, a country of great opportunities, where intelligence and labor are appreciated and rewarded.

I shall never forget my first impression upon arriving in the harbor of New York, where the flags of all nations salute each other on their arrival and departure in the most fraternal way. This fraternity does not prevent friendly competition and rivalry, since these are the conditions of progress. But these manifestations of progress prevent and condemn violence, murder and plunder, and prevent brutal force from interfering directly between individuals in the legitimate struggle of intelligence. I hope that as a result of this Peace Congress this state of things will soon be realized in all the world, and that soon we shall see the time when war will be forbidden among the nations and as severely condemned as murder is between citizens.

I am in the historic City of Boston, which I like to remember as the birthplace of Benjamin Franklin, who drew the spark from the clouds, — an experiment which you have ingeniously reproduced on some of your bank notes, — the spark which in its various applications is to-day the connecting link between men.

Here also in 1815 one of the first peace societies — the first important society — was established by Christian men and women. This fact gives me confidence in your efforts, because you laid the corner-stone of the edifice on a more enduring foundation than those who see in the peace movement only a question of progress and commercial prosperity. On the contrary, you see in the establishment of peace the realization of a commandment of God. You prove that in the Gospel there is a spirit from heaven more powerful than the spark of Franklin, a spirit which unites men closely over land and sea; I mean, the spirit of love and Christian charity.

Ladies and gentlemen, Monaco has preserved the remembrance of your Congress in 1902; some facts which I wish to point out to you will prove it.

One year and a half ago the *Institut International de la Paix* was founded there, the object of which is to be an arsenal of peace, a manufactory of peaceful arms. It will publish documents and statistics concerning peace and war. We have just published in two editions *La Bibliographie de L'Arbitrage et de la Paix*, by our friend Mr. La Fontaine.

We are preparing for the beginning of next year an Annuary of International Life. We shall publish in 1905 the History of International Arbitration in Switzerland. Since our foundation we have intended to publish exact and complete statistics of the general cost of war in the world, but it is difficult to obtain and classify all the figures that express the cost of war. So far we have only a few documents on this subject, and we would receive with pleasure any information which any of you may be able to supply.

I wish to add this characteristic fact: About a year after your Congress in Monaco, the garrison of the place, formerly important, on which depended the fortress of Monaco, was definitely disbanded, and the government of Monaco gave the first example of general disarmament.

The Chairman then introduced Mr. John Lund of Norway, for many years President of the Norwegian Parliament, and now Vice-President of the Nobel Committee, who spoke as follows :

RESPONSE OF HON. JOHN LUND.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have come here to bring a greeting from the land of the midnight sun, from the land of the vikings, from old Norway.

Some nine hundred years ago, my countrymen, the Norsemen, under the leadership of Leif Ericson, on one of their many adventurous raids found their way to America, and in memory of this event a statue has been erected to Leif Ericson here in Boston.

In Leif Ericson's time my countrymen did not understand enough to put their great discovery to use. Their open ships were not well fitted to make flying trips over the Atlantic in great numbers. However, the Norsemen, too, have since the foundation of the United States known how to appreciate the worth of America, and now for generations thousands upon thousands of Norway's sons and daughters have gone forth year by year to win from her virgin soil a reward of their labors, such as the old country with its harder, sterner nature could not afford them.

Some one and a half millions, or more than half the number of Norway's present population, have here under American free institutions found for the most part happiness and comfort. And I use this occasion to-day to express to you the thanks of the old country for the hundreds of thousands of happy Norse homes which America has bestowed upon our children who have come to her.

After Norway in 1814 got for herself a free constitution, our land, although amidst many struggles, has gone steadily forward. In our practical daily life, as is well known, the shipping industry of Norway may be reckoned among the greatest of the world. In art, science and literature I can mention names like Ole Bull, Ibsen, Björnsen, Edward Grieg and Nansen. Our land seeks, indeed, the noblest ideal of all, to fulfill her modest part in the general work of civilization.

And in this cause which has brought us together here, in the work for peace and arbitration, Norway has according to her means sought to make her contribution. Since the establishment of the Interparliamentary Union our land has been represented at nearly all of its conferences. The Norse Storthing was the first to sanction a considerable contribution to the Interparliamentary Union Bureau in Berne, and has since that time voted an annual contribution not only to that Bureau, but also to the International Peace Bureau at Berne.

Norway was among the very first of the European countries to try to bring about permanent treaties of arbitration with other lands. And I am glad to be able to inform you that our present Foreign Minister seems just as warmly interested in the matter as his predecessor more than half a score of years ago, when the Norse Storthing first raised the question, showed himself cold and indifferent to it. We are now negotiating regarding permanent arbitration treaties with ten different countries, and some of these proposed treaties are being brought to a successful conclusion.

I have dwelt so particularly upon these details both because our land, its history and its achievements, owing to our special political circumstances, are at present little known abroad, and because I think that these details are evidence that even a small country like Norway can yield its mite to the advancement of civilization in general and to the greatest movement of our time, the work of peace, if it is allowed to live its own independent life in accordance with its means and the circumstances under which it has been set in the world.

For the little work which Norway has undertaken in the service of peace, our land has already got special recognition. Our neighbor Sweden's great son, Mr. Alfred Nobel, has, as is well known, entrusted the Norse Storthing with the task of bestowing a yearly prize of about forty thousand dollars upon the person or persons who by competent work in the cause of peace have earned distinction. This prize has already been conferred in three consecutive years.

It is with feelings of exceeding pleasure that I, as a Norse representative, visit the United States as a delegate to this Thirteenth International Peace Congress. Not alone because I thereby get occasion to express my good wishes to the land that has bestowed happy homes upon so many of our children, but also because I am enabled to declare our thanks for the great work which America more than any other land in the world has carried out in the interests of peace. Names like Channing, Elihu Burritt, Sumner, Worcester, and many others, down to American men and women of our own day, stand out like sign posts and milestones on the great highroad of peace.

The great traditions, the holy remembrances of your brave ancestors, will, I am sure, inspire you all in the work for peace and justice, to go forward with the same energy and the same courage that will make you, as it has in so many other ways, the leading people in the world. [Applause.]

The Chairman: We shall now have the pleasure of hearing from Sweden, the Hon. John Olsson of Stockholm, member of the Swedish Parliament.

RESPONSE OF HON. JOHN OLSSON.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: After so many excellent speeches of prominent representative men from all parts of the world, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for me, as a delegate from that little land of Sweden, even in my own language to find new words to express gratitude for the splendid reception we have enjoyed. And the difficulty is vastly increased when I attempt to use the English language, which I speak but very imperfectly. However, you will allow me on behalf of the Swedish Peace Association and my countrymen, of whom so many thousands have found a new home in this great Republic, to say a few words.

I was one of the members of the Interparliamentary Peace Union, composed of delegates from nearly all the European Parliaments as well as your own Congress, who during a most splendid journey over this country enjoyed the hospitality of the American people, the American Congress and the American government. It seems to me that never before has a union of representatives from so many different nations received such honor and hospitality. We have seen much of the greatest interest in your great Union. We have seen your big and busy cities, your vast cornfields, your immense prairies, your beautiful Rocky Mountains — all so different from what we are accustomed to see in Europe. But the most different and remarkable is perhaps what we have *not* seen here. We have not seen soldiers in your streets. [Applause.] We have not seen great armies of men, taken from their business, their daily work, passing the best years of their youth in preparing for war. We have not seen, — what we deplore so much in Europe, — we have not seen here millions spent in erecting great fortresses on the frontier of a peaceable neighbor. Thus we have learned that the old saying, "If you wish peace, prepare for war!" *is not true.* [Applause.] On the contrary, big armies are the greatest menace to peace, because it is almost absolutely necessary that a big army sometimes have something to do. [Laughter.] This seems to be so clear that nobody could doubt it. Yet in Europe we are still fettered by the error that big armies are preparing peace. This is one of the lies which during many centuries has cheated the old nations. [Applause.]

Thus America is foremost in this regard as in so many others. You have proved that in the struggle for peace, justice and humanity it is not wise to depend on great armies and fortresses; that on the contrary they are generally obstacles in the way of peace and civilization.

In this noble struggle it is not always the greatest nations that lead; even a small nation can forward the progress of peace and civilization. I am proud to say that the great founder of so many institutions for peace and humanity, Alfred Nobel, was a native of our land, was a Swede. [Applause.]

I shall never forget that historical moment in our journey, when your noble President in the most expressive and sympathetic words promised to call upon the nations to join in another Peace Conference at The Hague, to devise new means for promoting international arbitration and international peace. [Applause.] I have a deep impression that this promise marks one of the most important steps on the way to peace and civilization that has ever been taken. And I am convinced that at that moment your President spoke out of the heart of all his fellow-citizens, Republicans and Democrats alike. [Applause.] I therefore hope to be in agreement with the opinion of this distinguished assembly when, speaking for my countrymen, I beg to express our deepest gratitude to President Roosevelt, and to the American people in whose name he spoke, for that noble and important promise. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now have the pleasure of hearing from Prof. Pierre Clerget of Le Locle, Switzerland.

RESPONSE OF M. PIERRE CLERGET.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I shall say only a few words concerning a small country, which, however, plays a great part in the international peace movement,—namely, Switzerland. [Applause.] The Peace Societies of Switzerland have charged me with the honor of bringing their greetings to the Congress.

We have about twenty-five Peace Societies in Switzerland, and many clergymen and teachers are members of them.

Switzerland is the seat of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, the Interparliamentary Bureau, and of the Peace and War Museum at Luzern, founded by the late Jean de Bloch, the author of "The Future of War."

The directors of this Museum have carried out the suggestions of Mrs. Mead at the Congress in Rouen. To enrich the department of peace they have hung up the portraits of many well-known friends of peace, and every picture is provided with quotations from the works of the person it represents.

I should like to cite in closing the three quotations which pleased me best at my last visit to the Museum. They are as follows:

> "Of all the desirable political changes which it seems to me possible for this generation to effect, I consider it by far the most important for the welfare of the race that every civilized nation should be pledged to offer peaceful arbitration to its opponent before the senseless, inhuman work of human slaughter begins." —*Andrew Carnegie.*

> "Reason is for us, for war is an outrage on reason; justice is for us, for war tramples justice under foot; civilization is for us, for war is the incarnation of barbarism; and, above all, religion is for us, for we have the benediction of Him who has said: 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.'"—*Henry Richard.*

> "People may laugh at the plan of arbitration, but, in my opinion, the warlike plan is infinitely more ludicrous. The inequality of horses, a disparity in the power of wielding the sword, or the possession of high powers of strategy in a general, are circumstances which the merest child can understand, and they have no connection with justice or national honor."—*Elihu Burritt.*

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now hear from the Hon. Albert K. Smiley, promoter, sustainer and hospitable host of the powerful gatherings of friends of arbitration on the beautiful mountain top and in the noble home at Lake Mohonk. Mr. Smiley will respond for the United States. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF HON. ALBERT K. SMILEY.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak. I am thoroughly delighted with this Congress. My heart is filled with gratitude that so many persons have gathered here to discuss the most important question that can come before the world, in my judgment. I verily believe that the time is not far distant when all the nations of the world will submit their disputes to the tribunal at The Hague, and I firmly believe that at the next meeting which the President of the United States proposes to call at The Hague there will be devised some scheme by which a permanent court with salaries fixed, and the judges living at The Hague, in the beautiful building which Mr. Carnegie is to erect there, will be established. I believe that all the nations will be inclined to submit their disputes to that Court, possibly with some slight reservations in regard to the preservation of their territory. I hope to live long enough to see that thing accomplished — and I expect to do so. [Applause.]

I want to say one word to those persons who are here from foreign countries, and it is this: At our conferences at Lake Mohonk — we have had ten of them — we have wanted very much to get more representatives from foreign countries, and so I am going to take the list of foreign delegates here, and you will all get an invitation to come to my house at Lake Mohonk and spend three or four days in the early part of next June. And I hope when you get such an invitation you will be sure to come, and help forward there the cause which we all have at heart.

The Chairman: The last country to hear from this morning is Armenia, and we shall now have the pleasure of listening to Dr. Jean Loris-Melikoff.

Mr. Adolphe Smith: As there is no longer time for translations, Dr. Loris-Melikoff, who represents the Armenians here, instead of reading his speech, has asked me to read to you an English translation of it, and thus save time.

RESPONSE OF DR. JEAN LORIS-MELIKOFF.

The delegation sent by the Catholicos, the Supreme Patriarch of all the Armenians, to plead their cause with the heads of the civilized nations, wished to be present at this Congress, to affirm their deep attachment to the principles of peace.

In conveying the greetings of this little nation of a few million people, I take the liberty of reminding you that the voice which brings you its fraternal salutation comes from far away, from the frontier between Europe and Asia, from the native country of the ancient Armenian nation that saw the birth and rise of our present civilization.

The Armenian nation, from the dissolution of the Roman Empire to our own time, in spite of invasions, calamities and disasters, has always represented culture and civilization in the Orient, at the cost of incalculable suffering. That is why the neighboring nations, bitter enemies of human progress, have tried to exterminate, systematically and at all costs, this element devoted to civilization and peace. And who knows? Perhaps at this moment this nation is struggling between life and death — its tormentors, making a mock of our meeting here, are with unscrupulous cynicism shedding innocent blood.

The description of the recent martyrdom of this people will come in due time in the course of the discussions of this Congress, which I hope will find a practical and efficacious solution of the Armenian question in accordance with the resolutions passed by the last four Peace Congresses, and will point out a way to put an end to a state of things which is a disgrace to humanity, and the disappearance of which would contribute to secure and confirm the peace of the world.

But at this time, in the name of this suffering nation and of its Supreme Head, the Catholicos Chrimian Hairik, the venerable man of eighty-five whose whole life has been devoted to his people, I wish success and prosperity to the great Republic of the United States, the natural protector of the oppressed, and I desire to express our deep respect and admiration for its distinguished President, Mr. Roosevelt, who has just done us the honor of receiving us, and has expressed his hearty sympathy with the Armenian people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we close this morning's meeting, I will call on the Secretary, Dr. Trueblood, to present some matters.

THE SECRETARY: The next order of business is the report of the International Peace Bureau for the year 1904 on the events relating to war and peace.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE BUREAU

FOR THE YEAR 1904, ON THE EVENTS RELATING TO WAR AND PEACE.

The outbreak since January last of the war between Japan and Russia for commercial, military, and political preponderance in the Far East, an event which had been brewing for several years, has furnished a semblance of an argument to those who pretend that there will always be to the very end of time some part of the globe where men will kill one another.

We say "a semblance of an argument," because the Russo-Japanese war has taken place in a region remote from the centre of influence of the peace propaganda. The principles of peace, though they have made progress, have not yet been accepted everywhere. The time will come when the Russians and the Japanese will renounce the attempt to secure their political purposes by violence, as other nations have already done. In the meantime the outbreak of wars in countries which are yet in the morning of civilization does not prove, and never will prove, anything against the grand principles of the solidarity of peoples.

The friends of peace have since the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war made numerous and earnest efforts to try to induce both the Russian and Japanese governments to have recourse to a friendly solution of the conflict, and the other powers signatory of the Hague Convention to bring about a settlement of the difficulty between the belligerents by arbitration or mediation. They have done their duty, and will find no occasion to reproach themselves, when the responsibilities for the war have been finally determined by public opinion.

Without entering into the details of these efforts, we may here cite the concluding sentences of the "Memorial upon the Russo-Japanese Conflict," which the Permanent International Peace Bureau sent out in December, 1903, to all Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and which it had published in its organ, *La Correspondance Bi-Mensuelle.*

"It seems to us that at the present stage of the negotiations it is not impossible to find some middle ground between the extreme pretentions of the two powers. Furthermore, a war between Russia and Japan on the shores of the Yellow Sea will, like most wars, settle nothing, but will serve only to prepare the way for others. It will necessarily result in the weakening of the two belligerents, and making them less capable of fulfilling their role in the civilization of the Far East. An arrangement, on the other hand, based on mutual concessions recommended by the great powers would leave both of them a sufficiently large sphere in those vast regions scarcely yet open to the commerce of the world.

"In conclusion, we call the attention of the powers to the urgent necessity of a joint effort on their part with the Russian and Japanese governments, in harmony with Section 2 of the Hague Convention of the 29th of July, 1899, which is as follows:

"'In case of grave disagreement or conflict, before appealing to arms, the signatory powers agree to have recourse as far as circumstances will permit to the good offices or the mediation of one or more friendly powers.'"

Since the opening of hostilities we have several times renewed our effort to bring about conciliation; and especially after the meeting of the Commission of the Bureau in April last, we addressed to all the governments a pressing invitation to offer mediation.

Up to the present moment the governments not involved in the conflict have limited their efforts to the localization of the war and to the strict maintenance of collective neutrality. But the moment is perhaps not far off when they will be able in a collective way to induce the belligerents to listen to the voice of reason, of justice and humanity, by insisting upon the fact that the present war will be all the more fruitless because neither of the belligerent parties, on account of the pacific ideas now prevailing, can expect effective support toward the realization of its ambitious purposes.

One of the chief blessings of the recent Anglo-French agreement has been that at the present time it has greatly strengthened and developed these pacific ideas.

It is possible of course that in the aberration of their judgment, which has been led away by vain hopes, the Russians and the Japanese will remain deaf to this appeal. Would the powers, if an offer of mediation by them should be rejected, find themselves necessitated thereby to have recourse to the use of military force to impose peace? Such is not our opinion. For before having recourse to such extreme measures the powers would still have at their disposal other means of coercion. The most efficacious of these might possibly be that of rigorously closing their exchequer to the further appeals of Russia and Japan for new war loans. It is well known that the treasuries of the two belligerents are exhausted at the end of every month, that their war expenses reach enormous figures, and that left to their own financial resources they would be absolutely incapable of continuing the struggle under present conditions.

Under these circumstances Russia and Japan are at the mercy of those who make loans to them, and they could not keep up the campaign for two months if they were not sustained by the hope that their foreign creditors would make still further advances to them in order to save what they have already loaned. Up to a certain point this hope corresponds to the facts of the case, and the expectations of the borrowers have up to the present moment been verified. But everything here below has an end, especially in financial matters, and we should not be surprised if the Western Europeans and the Americans should finally say, on reckoning up the chances of reimbursement for the new as well as the old loans, "So far and no farther." Whenever they say this seriously they will render the continuation of the present war impossible.

They might also, without waiting for this moment to arrive, take advantage of the first decided success secured by one of the belligerents to induce the conqueror to make offers of peace which his adversary might accept.

These reflections bring us to the consideration of another deplorable situation, perpetuated likewise by the too great facility with which certain governments have accumulated debts upon debts by offering large rates of interest to western speculators. We have reference to the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire, and especially to the sufferings to which the Christian populations of Macedonia and Armenia have been exposed. These questions we have treated in a recent Memorial, which concludes as follows:

"(*a*) For Macedonia, by urging the competent authorities to bring about a conference of representatives of the powers signatory of the Treaty of Berlin of the 13th of July, 1878, Turkey included, with a view of hearing the report of the governments of Russia and Austro-Hungary on the results of their recent diplomatic intervention at Constantinople, and of securing a solution of the controversy by arbitration, if they should conclude that it is time to put an end to the dilatory responses of the Turkish government which constantly put in peril the peace of the nations.

"(*b*) For Armenia, by demanding serious guarantee for the execution of the promise made to the Armenians in Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin, which is as follows:

"The Sublime Port undertakes to realize without further delay the amelioration and reform which are demanded by local necessities in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and the Kurds. It will periodically give information in regard to the measures adopted for this purpose to the powers, which shall see that they are carried out."

In contrast to the gloomy pictures which the past year gives us from the point of view of the peace movement, we are happy to be able to put down to the credit of the year a number of encouraging facts. In no former period has so much been accomplished to bring the peoples and the governments of the world under the sway of international arbitration. As particularly important we may point out the following conventions in their chronological order:

The Franco-English arbitration treaty of October, 1903.
The treaty of arbitration between France and Italy, of December, 1903.
The Anglo-Italian arbitration treaty of January, 1904.
The arbitration treaty between Denmark and Holland, February, 1904.
The Franco-Spanish arbitration treaty, March, 1904.
The Anglo-Spanish arbitration treaty, March, 1904.
The new Franco-English agreement concerning Egypt, Morocco, Newfoundland and Western Africa, as well as Siam, the New Hebrides and Madagascar, April, 1904.
The arbitration treaty between France and Holland, April, 1904.
The Anglo-German arbitration treaty, July, 1904.
The Anglo-Scandinavian arbitration treaty, July, 1904.
The treaty between Spain and Portugal.

To the Franco-Italian arbitration treaty has been added the Franco-Italian convention concerning labor legislation, signed in April, 1904. Finally, the Hague Arbitration Court, after having rendered its award in the Venezuela affair, is at the present time deliberating upon the controversy concerning the taxing of improvements on leased lands in Japan (the Japanese House Tax). The Court is also to be entrusted with deciding between the Netherlands and France in the case of any differences which may arise between those two countries in reference to the submarine cable which connects Saigon with the west coast of Borneo.

Among the questions which were pending, the most important, namely, that of the Alaska Boundary, has been settled during the course of the year. The question of Barotze Land between England and Portugal has been submitted to the arbitration of the King of Italy. Ecuador and Peru, as well as Peru and Colombia, have chosen the King of Spain as arbitrator in their boundary disputes. The controversy between Italy and Peru relative to the interpretation of Article 18 of the treaty of friendship and commerce of 1874, has been settled by the arbitration of Mr. Winkler, a member of the Swiss Federal Tribunal.

We cannot better close this report than by recalling the following words uttered by Mr. Roosevelt on the occasion of his message to the Congress of the United States:

"We have not yet arrived at the point where we can avoid all wars by the aid of arbitration, but with prudence, firmness and wisdom the provocations and pretexts of war may be removed and conflicts adjusted by rational methods."

For the Commission of the International Peace Bureau.

ELIE DUCOMMUN.

BERNE, SWITZERLAND, August 26, 1904.

THE SECRETARY: The next matter is the announcement of the Vice-Presidents of the Congress. It is usual to appoint one Vice-President for each country represented, and the following have been designated by the different delegations (For the list of Vice-Presidents see page 4):

The Secretary then presented a large number of letters, memorials, telegrams and cablegrams, conveying greetings and good wishes to the Congress from individuals and associations in different countries. A number were presented later in the Congress, but they are all summarized together. Among these was the following letter from Andrew Carnegie:

SKIBO CASTLE, DORNOCH, SUTHERLAND,
September 27, 1904.

Dear Mr. President: I much regret missing the meeting of the International Peace Conference. Since we have at last in the Hague Tribunal a permanent High Court for the settlement of international disputes, more and more my thoughts turn upon the next possible and necessary step forward to an agreement by certain powers to prevent appeals to war by civilized nations.

Suppose, for instance, that Britain, France, Germany and America, with such other minor States as would certainly join them, were to take that position, prepared, if defied, to enforce peaceful settlement, the first offender (if there ever were one) being rigorously dealt with, war would at one fell swoop be banished from the earth. For such a result, surely the people of these four countries would be willing to risk much. The risk, however, would be trifling. A strong combination would efface it altogether. I think this one simple plan most likely to commend itself to the intelligent masses. A committee might be formed to consider this. If a body of prominent men of each nation agreed to unite in urging the coöperation of their respective countries in the movement, I think the idea would soon spread.

One cannot imagine for our Republic a prouder position than that of pioneer in such a task — she who has been foremost in urging arbitration, first also to urge five important powers to submit their differences to the Court of Peace. Nor can I imagine more fitting apostles to urge this upon the powers than our present Secretary of State, who is to honor you at the coming meeting in Boston, and our present President, who recently led the powers to The Hague. Having secured a permanent court for the settlement of international disputes, the time seems ripe for the same agencies to consider the one step further needed to complete the work.

Very truly yours, always for peace,

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

LETTER FROM FREDERIC PASSY.

NEUILLY, NEAR PARIS, September 12, 1904.

The President of the Boston Peace Congress: Prevented, to my great regret, by my age and the growing weakness of my eyesight from going to the Boston Congress as well as to the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis, I nevertheless do not feel contented to be present in mind and heart only in the midst of the great assembly, and I pray you to be so kind as to represent me before the Congress.

Tell your colleagues, many of whom have for a long time been my friends and coworkers, how much it costs me not to be able, for the first time in many years, to take part in their labors, and convey to them my most cordial salutation as well as my good wishes.

The circumstances of the time are serious. Never, since the organization of our annual meetings, has the abominable scourge which we are combating assumed such proportions as those which it has attained within the past few months. It is a defiance of civilization. It must be the last one. By a unanimous uprising of the conscience of the world the stupid horror of these human hecatombs must be forever condemned. It is the duty of the governments which have commenced by treaties and conventions of friendship to give pledges to the policy of right and humanity, to take efficacious measures to put a stop among themselves to these bloody follies.

But public opinion must speak with sufficient force to encourage the good purposes of some of them to neutralize and overcome the resistance and hesitation of others, and to constrain effectively those who call themselves the shepherds of the peoples to merit this glorious name in place of that which it has been possible too often to give them, namely, butchers and public malefactors.

The Old World, which at this moment has its eyes fixed upon St. Louis and Boston, is expecting from the New World the decisive manifestation which shall put an end to the regime of misery, insecurity and mutual spoliation, and shall permit us to hail as the eternal honor of the twentieth century the opening of the blessed era of mutual respect, of labor and of peace.

Please to accept, Mr. President, in this hope for you and for your colleagues, the assurance of my feelings of warm and cordial sympathy.

FREDERIC PASSY,
Member of the Institute of France,
President of the French International Arbitration Society.

LETTER FROM HODGSON PRATT.

LE PECQ, FRANCE, September 17, 1904.

Dear Dr. Trueblood: May I ask you to include my name in the list of those who write to express regret that they cannot take part in the Congress of peacemakers at Boston. Nothing causes me so much to deprecate the limitations of old age as my inability to be present on this occasion and listen to the wise and strong men who will represent the United States.

Your nation enjoys unique advantages for rendering great services to mankind; and all the world trusts that she will use her influence to hasten the triumph of the sacred cause of international justice and unity.

The curse of man lies in the spirit of Cain, which is that of Hate, and leads inevitably to fratricide. The deliverance of man lies in the spirit of Christ, which is that of Love, and leads to coöperation. Without the latter there can be no security for human welfare, and in a world dominated by war the philosophers, the reformers and the rulers have all alike failed to give happiness to mankind. The condition precedent of realizing man's true ideals is to be found alone in the assurance of universal peace.

Yours heartily,

HODGSON PRATT.

Similar letters of greeting and good wishes were also presented from Emile Arnaud of Luzarches, France, president of the Peace Congress at Rouen last year; from Gaston Moch of Monaco, president of the Monaco Congress of 1902; from Dr. Charles Richet of the Medical Faculty of Paris, president of the Paris Congress of 1900; from Elie Ducommun, secretary of the International Peace Bureau at Berne; from Felix Moscheles of London, chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Arbitration and Peace Association; from Paul Allegret, president of the Hâvre *Amis de la Paix;* from Edouard Spalikowsky, Rouen, secretary of the Standing Committee of the French Peace Societies; from Jules Tripier, president of the *Société de la Paix d'Abbeville et Ponthieu;* from E. Sarrazin, president of the Peace Society of the Familistère de Guise; from Dr. Max Kolben of Vienna; from Hon. Wayne MacVeagh of Bryn Mawr, Pa.; from Hon. Carl Schurz of New York, who says "there is no cause with which I sympathize more heartily"; from Hon. Theodore E. Burton, M. C. from Ohio, who assures the Committee of his "earnest interest in the cause"; from Bishop Henry W. Warren of Colorado, who would gladly assist in "making justice and righteousness as necessary among nations as among individuals"; from Fray Marcelino, Bishop of San Juan de Cuyo, Argentina, one of the two bishops who were instrumental in having the statue of Christ placed on the Andean border between Argentina and Chile; from Mrs. May Wright Sewall, president of the National Council of Women, with "every good wish for the success of the meeting"; from Dr. H. Pereira Mendes of New York, wishing "all success to the Peace Congress"; from Edward Q. Norton, editor of the *Standard*, Daphne, Ala.; from Mrs. V. G. Whitney, St. Louis.

Telegrams and cablegrams of greeting were received and presented from the Nobel Committee, Christiania, Norway; from Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant, Paris; from Mr. E. Reveillaud, Deputy, Versailles, France; from Frau Leonore Selenka, Munich; from Elizabeth Stuart Phelps Ward, Newton Centre, Mass., expressing the hope that this Congress "might mean an international legislature"; from the Countess Bobrinsky in London conveying the greetings of the *Alliance Universelle des Femmes* of Paris; from Mary C. C. Bradford, Fort Collins, Col., pledging coöperation of the Colorado Federation of Women's Clubs; from King's County, N. Y. Women's Christian Temperance Union; from Wallace Radcliffe, moderator of the Presbytery of Washington, D. C.; from the editors of the *Christian Herald*, New York, rejoicing "that in many lands the people are awakening to the sin and folly of war"; from the Maine Free Baptist Ministers' Conference in session at Blaine, Me.; from Charles Henry Butler, reporter of the United States Supreme Court; from the Nebraska Baptist Convention, three hundred and fifty delegates assembled at Fremont, Neb.; from the Board of Education of Grand Rapids, Mich., whose Text-Book Committee had recommended a history of peace for use in the schools; from the New Orleans Board of Trade, composed of six hundred leading business men, "endorsing the efforts of the Congress to place the settlement of disputes among nations upon a higher and more humanitarian plane than that of physical force"; from Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Chicago; from Mary Frost Ormsby Evans, Fort Collins, Col., conveying greetings of five thousand women; from D. V. Orkovitz, Russian resident in London, "earnestly desiring success of efforts to establish international disarmed peace," as sufferings of his countrymen from the armed peace were as great as those from actual war; from the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of the United States and Canada, through its president, Dr. H. P. Mendes of New York; from the Congregation of the Church of Our Father, Buffalo; from the Maine Spiritualist Association assembled at Waterville, Me.; from the Vermont Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled at Bellows Falls, Vt.; from the Worcester Conference of Unitarian Churches assembled at Upton, Mass.; from the New York State Convention of Universalists assembled at Utica, N. Y.; from the National Spiritualist Association assembled at Waterville, Me.

The following message to the Congress was received through the Associated Press from Sir Thomas Barclay, London:

> "I am sorry I am unable to attend the Boston conference. I attach immense importance to that conference, because such a number of distinguished, practical men have taken an interest in it. The next greatest step taken in the history of international relations will, I expect, be a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and America. I wish the conference great success in their meeting."

Letters of greeting were presented from the following church and ministerial organizations, wishing the Congress success and urging, in substance, the abolition of the barbarism of war and the application of the principles of the religion of Jesus to the conduct of all national and international affairs: All Souls Church, Elizabeth, N. J.; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Chicago; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Detroit; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Denver; Portland, Ore., Ministerial Association; Albany Methodist Preachers' Meeting; Buffalo Baptist Ministers' Conference; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Richmond, Va.; Baptist Ministers' Conference of the District of Columbia; the Unitarian, the Methodist and the Congregational churches of Stowe, Vt.; Meeting of Congregational Ministers, Providence, R. I., and vicinity; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Pittsburg; Kansas Baptist Ministerial Association, six hundred members, through G. W. Trout, president, Pittsburg, Kan.; Methodist Preachers' Association of Harrisburg, Pa., and vicinity; New Haven Baptist Ministers' Conference; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Providence, R. I.; Boston West Baptist Association assembled at Hyde Park, Mass.; Baptist Ministers' Conference of Indianapolis; Baptist Ministers' Association of Wachusett, Mass.; Boston Presbyterian Ministers' Association; Ministerial Association of Rochester; Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Minneapolis; Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Atlanta; Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Baltimore, through Rev. J. T. Stone; Presbyterian Ministers'

Association of Nashville; Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Portland, Ore.; Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Philadelphia; First Unitarian Church of Richmond, Va.; Hillside Universalist Church of Medford, Mass.; and from a meeting of the citizens of St. John, N. B., convened on September 25, at the request of the clergy of all denominations, and presided over by the Mayor, with a set of important resolutions which will be found among the Annexes at the end of this volume.

Messages of greeting and good wishes were likewise received from peace societies and associations other than church organizations as follows: the Trades Union Congress held at Leeds, England, representing one and a half million Trade Unionists; *Société de l'Education Pacifique* (twenty-five sections), Croisilles, France, and forty-six Associations of Members of Public Instruction in France; the National Council of Women of Dresden, Germany; the Composite Club, Uxbridge, Mass.; Hillside Young People's Christian Union, Medford, Mass.; the Brotherhood of the Illuminati, Boston; the Philadelphia Board of Trade, Philadelphia; the *Wiener Akademische Friedensverein*, Vienna, Austria, conveying their kindest regards to the students of the American universities, and their desire that the students of all universities might be brought to coöperate in promotion of the Peace Movement.

One of the most interesting of the messages which came to the Congress was the following one from Melbourne, Australia, signed by six hundred and thirty-four prominent citizens of the Commonwealth, including Members of Parliament, professors in the Sidney and Melbourne Universities, leading clergymen, the officers of the Peace, Humanity and Arbitration Society in Victoria, philanthropists, etc.:

TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF PEACE TO BE HELD IN BOSTON, U. S. A., IN OCTOBER, 1904.

We, the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth of Australia, beg to offer our very cordial greetings to you, the members of the Thirteenth International Congress of Peace assembling at Boston.

We desire to express our heartiest sympathy with you in your noble efforts to enlighten the conscience and raise the moral standard of mankind; to break down international prejudice and the walls of racial jealousy, to abolish the barbarous and irrational appeal to the sword, and to promote that international goodwill and concord which are so essential to the well-being and progress of the world.

We deplore with you the disgrace to Christendom, and the scandal to civilization, involved in war — the inevitable violation and suspension of the moral law on the battlefield, the needless pain and sorrow, the sufferings of mothers and children, the nameless danger to womanhood, the licensed deceit and cruelty, the wanton waste of energy, life, and property, together with the crushing burden of taxation, always inseparable from war.

Although separated from you by long distance, we feel ourselves one with you in spirit in protesting against the militarism and fierce war-spirit of to-day that breed such terrible evils; the intrigues of heartless financiers and an unscrupulous section of the press, which stir up strife and embroil the nations in deadly feuds; and the assumed right of might, on the part of great nations, to crush and "wipe out" the smaller peoples, and treat their patriotism as a crime; and we rejoice to be associated with our brothers and sisters of many lands in the splendid cause of arbitration and peace.

We congratulate you on the gradual triumph of humanitarian principles over false and anti-social ideals of brute force and "glory," and a spurious patriotism which is in reality treason to the best interests of one's country. The vigorous Peace Societies which have recently sprung into existence, numbering among their members leading statesmen, clergymen, lawyers, professors, literary men, press men who are an honor to their profession, and noble women; the establishment of the Hague Tribunal; the settlement in recent years, by arbitration, of international disputes which, in a former age, would probably have led to brutal conflicts; and the ratification lately of several treaties of arbitration, such as that between France and Britain, should fill the friends of peace with hope and encouragement to work on.

Our enemies are many and powerful, but truth is great and shall prevail, notwithstanding sneers and misrepresentations prompted by thoughtlessness, ignorance, selfish financial, political, and commercial interests, and the survival of slowly dying brute instincts in human nature.

That the work of your Congress may be crowned with success, and that it may prove one step at least further on the way towards the goal of Universal Peace and the Commonwealth of Man, is the earnest hope of your Australian brethren, who will watch with deep interest the proceedings of your great International Congress.

MELBOURNE, August, 1904.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will say to our foreign friends that no meeting in Boston in behalf of any good cause is complete without the presence of the Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale. [Applause.]

DR. HALE: I have the privilege of speaking at this moment, because I am the oldest minister in active work in Boston, to express the welcome which this assembly wishes to give to the great Council of the American Protestant Episcopal Church which meets here to-morrow.

I would like to say that I have just come from the devotional meeting, which is open to the whole Congress every morning at 9 o'clock in the South Congregational Church. Those daily meetings have been arranged by conference between the heads of the largest communions — Christian and Jewish — in Boston. At this conference the Methodists were represented by Bishop Mallalieu, the Episcopalians by Bishop Lawrence, the Catholics by Archbishop Williams, the Baptists by Dr. Rowley, and the Congregationalists and Unitarians were also represented. It is the first time known to me that any such religious meetings have been held since the time of the Emperor Constantine, and if these meetings were to be famous for nothing else in the history of Boston they would be for this reason.

Now permit me to read the resolution which has been prepared:

"The Thirteenth International Peace Congress sends its greetings to the National Convention of the Episcopal Church in its assembly in Boston, confident in its interest in the great work we have in hand. The members of that Convention are cordially invited to share in our assemblies. Thank God, we need not ask the august convention of the servants and followers of the Prince of Peace for sympathy, assistance and encouragement in all our endeavors."

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Three committees were then appointed to prepare the business of the Congress and submit resolutions, as follows:

A. ON CURRENT QUESTIONS.

Belgium, Senator Houzeau de Lehaie; France, Alphonse Jouet; Germany, Dr. Adolf Richter; Great Britain, Dr. W. Evans Darby; Monaco, the Abbé Pichot; Switzerland, Pierre Clerget; United States, Charles F. Dole.

B. QUESTIONS OF .INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE LIKE.

Belgium, Senator H. La Fontaine; Denmark, Mrs. B. A. Lockwood; France, J. Prudhommeaux; Germany, Edward de Neufville; Great Britain, Joseph G. Alexander; Italy, E. T. Moneta; Sweden, Hon. John Olsson; United States, Hon. John I. Gilbert.

C. ON PROPAGANDA.

Belgium, Madame H. La Fontaine; France, A. Gignoux; Germany, Richard Feldhaus; Great Britain, J. Frederick Green; Norway, Hon. John Lund; Switzerland, Theodore Ruyssen; United States, Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead.

The meeting then adjourned.

At the close of Tuesday morning's session, at 1.15 o'clock, a luncheon was given to the foreign delegates in Chipman Hall, Tremont Temple, by the Economic Club of Boston. About one hundred and fifty persons were at the tables, and at the close of the luncheon brief addresses were made by William H. Lincoln, President of the Club, and by Dr. G. B. Clark and G. H. Perris, of the foreign delegates.

Public Meeting in Tremont Temple.

Tuesday Evening, October 4, 1904.

THE WORK AND INFLUENCE OF THE HAGUE COURT.

DR. TRUEBLOOD called the meeting to order at 8 o'clock, and said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: The original arrangement for this meeting to-night was that the Hon. Andrew D. White, our ex-Minister to Germany and the chairman of the American delegation at the Hague Conference, was to preside and to be one of the speakers. We all very much regret that Mr. White, who was so influential in the setting up of the Hague Court, is prevented by the state of his health from being here and speaking to us on the important subject of the evening.

We are fortunate, however, in having another gentleman here who has had wide diplomatic experience, and now has the very great and merited honor of being a member of the Hague Court — one of the four members from the United States. The result of the Hague Conference was, you know, the setting up of a permanent international tribunal of arbitration, which in April, 1901, was declared established and open for business. There are now seventy-two members of that Court from twenty-two nations of the world, and the distinguished gentleman who is to preside over this meeting and to speak to us of the work of the Court is one of these seventy-two gentlemen — among the most distinguished diplomats, international jurists and publicists in the world.

I now have the very great honor of introducing as the presiding officer of this meeting the Hon. Oscar S. Straus, ex-Minister of the United States to Turkey, and at present a member of the International Court at The Hague.

THE PEACE CONGRESSES AND THE HAGUE TRIBUNAL.

ADDRESS OF HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS.

Ladies and Gentlemen: No one can regret more than I do the absence on this important occasion of my esteemed friend and colleague, the Hon. Andrew D. White, who, although we have no diplomatic career in this country, because of his extraordinary fitness has occupied for the last thirty years some of the most important diplomatic positions in this country, having brought to that work a ripe scholarship, learning and ability second to none of the great men that we have sent abroad to represent our country. It is a great regret that he is not here, for no one could have spoken with more authority and with more knowledge of the formation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague than he. He was the chairman of the Commission that was sent out by us to the Hague Conference, which Conference formulated and adopted the treaty that constituted the Hague Tribunal. I feel therefore that I cannot replace him, but I can only unite with you in the regret that he is not here.

From Marathon to Waterloo distinguished poets, artists, historians glorified the achievements of war. From that time on the legend began to take effect: "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." I think that the establishment of the Hague Tribunal, and the wonderful work that has been done by the peace societies throughout the world, and the spreading of the sentiment of peace, justify us in saying that the message of the twentieth century is that "Peace has victories far more glorious than war." [Applause.]

The *leit motif* of the national spirit among nations changes from age to age, and so consequently do the causes that bring about conflict and war. Beginning with modern times, with the Reformation, we first note as the dominant war cause ecclesiastical enmities, the conflicts between Romanism and Protestantism, which brought on that terrible age of devastating wars known in history as the Thirty Years' War, over whose bloody pits was concluded in 1648 the famous Treaty of Westphalia, which was framed by the first great governmental peace congress and from which dates the permanent diplomatic system of modern times.

With the lapse of another century the *leit motif* of nations changed from ecclesiastical enmities to the hunger for conquest and territorial expansion, beginning with the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), which terminated in the second great governmental peace congress, which framed the Treaty of Paris, and which, extending to this hemisphere, adjusted the colonial possessions of Great Britain, France and Spain, and so materially altered the map of the American continent. This period of conquest culminated in the infuriated heroism of the Napoleonic wars, and was terminated in 1815 by the third and, up to that time, the most important governmental peace congress in all history, which framed the Treaty of Vienna. By this treaty was definitely established the balance of power between European States, which lasted for half a century, until it was extended and reconstructed after the Russo-Turkish War, by the fourth great governmental peace congress, which framed in 1878 the Treaty of Berlin. At this congress Great Britain and Germany, under their distinguished premiers Disraeli, Salisbury and Bismarck, and the other great European powers, under their foremost statesmen, won a more decisive and more enduring victory than their armies had won at Sebastopol, Metz and Plevna. They caused the war clouds that hung black and threatening from the Baltic to the tropics to roll by, and ushered in the bright sun which shed its rays of "peace with honor" over the trembling chancelleries of Europe and Asia.

From Hugo Grotius to William Penn, and from William Penn to William Ellery Channing, and from Channing and Charles Sumner to Jean de Bloch, publicists, dreamers, philosophers and divines have advocated the cause of peace with that persistent devotion that so noble a cause can awaken in the souls of men whose hearts are attuned to Humanity's universal plea. They have through all these years prepared the great powers of the world for the greatest and most representative Peace Congress of all times, the Peace Conference at The Hague.

The work of this Conference, the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Arbitration by the representatives of the twenty-six leading nations of the world, marks not only the crowning glory of the nineteenth century, but, with God's blessing, the most enduring humanitarian achievement of the ages. Although the time was not yet ripe to enable this Conference to succeed in lessening the armaments of war, the very establishment of the Permanent Tribunal, with its nearly four score members ever ready to respond to the nations' call for the adjustment of international differences, cannot fail in time to effectively contribute to that inevitable end and tend more and more to bring "the future of humanity under the majesty of the law."

As Americans and hopeful advocates of peace you will pardon the justified pride we feel in the tribute paid to our country only a few days ago by that distinguished French peace advocate, publicist and statesman, a leading delegate to the Peace Conference, and a member of the Permanent Tribunal, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. I quote from his statement given to the Associated Press. After expressing his regret for his inability to be present with us, a regret which I am sure is shared by every one here, he said:

> "I had hoped at Boston to recognize publicly the grand and decisive services rendered to the cause of international arbitration by the United States, and particularly by President Roosevelt. Better than any one, I know that the Court at The Hague stood deserted, abandoned and ridiculed until the day when he had the courage, generosity and foresight to save it. That act alone has entitled him to the thanks of all Europe for his pacific and liberal spirit." [Applause.]

We gladly share the glory of having been the first among the nations to throw open the doors of the Tribunal with our sister republic, the Republic of Mexico, who spontaneously united with us in referring the Pious Fund case to the Court, and (we are happy to share that glory as well) with all the powers, great and small, who were parties to the Venezuela controversy.

While the Hague Conference was not able, because the time was not yet ripe, to limit the progressive increase of armaments and the economic burdens that that ascending scale of war preparations entails upon the nations in time of peace, we need not be without hope that there is much truth in the thesis developed by Jean de Bloch in his great book, "The Future of War," that the immense drain of the increasing cost of war and armaments will necessarily, from purely economic reasons, compel retrenchment and limitation.

It was my privilege during the past summer to deliver an address before our Naval War College at Newport. My audience was composed entirely of distinguished naval officers and admirals, captains, commanders and lieutenants in our navy. My subject, which was left to their choice, was the "Scope and Meaning of the Hague Tribunal," and I am gratified to bear my testimony here that among no class of our people could be found a set of men who have a deeper and more sympathetic interest in furthering the cause of peace. I am informed that the same is true especially in regard to the naval men of other nations, and that we can count upon them as our most effective allies.

The very fact that behind the world's diplomacy stands ever open the doors of the Hague Tribunal, whose permanent mission is the peaceful adjustment of international differences, cannot fail to have an ever increasing voice in the chancelleries of nations and on the deck of every warship of every civilized power. [Applause.]

Time does not permit me to dwell upon the scope and meaning of the Hague Treaty, upon its three plans and methods to lessen the causes of war, respectively, Commissions of Inquiry, Mediation and Arbitration. I entirely agree with the late Frederick W. Holls, the distinguished secretary of the American Commission, the historian of the Peace Conference, whose untimely death we so deeply deplore, in his estimate of the treaty as "the Magna Charta of International Law." It is not only that, it is an International Covenant on the Mount. [Applause.]

The treaty has been criticised as lacking obligatory power. Technically speaking that is true, and it is also true that its compelling force rests upon the highest and most binding considerations among nations, upon international honor and the moral grandeur of the signatory powers. [Applause.] It will require time and experience to develop its true and full scope and meaning; just as it required time and experience to develop the full scope and meaning of the Constitution of these United States. The significance of the treaty as an effective instrument of peace will largely depend upon the construction and method of application of Article 27, defining the duties of the signatory powers. That section provides:

> "The signatory powers consider it their duty, in case a serious dispute threatens to break out between two or more of them, to remind these latter that the Permanent Court of Arbitration is open to them. Consequently they declare that the fact of reminding the parties in controversy of the provisions of the present convention and the advice given to them in the higher interest of peace, to have recourse to the Permanent Court, can only be considered as an exercise of good offices."

That section alone changed the international law of the world. How and in what measure the initiative provided for by this article is to be exercised is one of the highest importance, which time and circumstances will and must develop. The subject did not escape the wise forethought of the Conference, but it was determined by the majority to leave the provision in its present form, doubtless having in mind that time, circumstances and experience would develop the most effective form of initiative. This Congress and future congresses could not, in my judgment, address themselves to a more practical and imperative subject than the ascertainment and development of the most acceptable and effective method and plan as to how and by whom this initiative is to be invoked and applied. I will not forestall such a consideration of the subject by venturing any suggestions or opinion, but will content myself with emphasizing with all earnestness the extreme importance of the subject.

In conclusion, I cannot speak with authority, or even with an intimate knowledge of facts, but I may be permitted to express the feeling of disappointment which was shared by many, that, largely growing out of the failure of an international understanding to invoke the initiative contemplated by the section quoted, the full force and moral effect of the treaty could not be, or was not, applied in a supreme effort to avert the appalling war now raging with such lurid destructiveness between Russia and Japan. Under the treaty the right to offer good offices or mediation appertains to the powers even during the course of hostilities, and it is provided that the exercise of this right shall never be regarded as an unfriendly act.

May the voice of this Congress awaken the nations to the exercise of their moral obligations, and may the Hague Treaty be sent upon its mediating mission of peace by the aroused public sentiment of the world as one of the practical fruits of the deliberations of this Thirteenth International Peace Congress. [Great applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now hear from Mr. Joseph G. Alexander, Secretary for many years of the International Law Association, which has coöperated with us and done so much for the cause for which we are assembled here.

ADDRESS OF MR. JOSEPH G. ALEXANDER.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very glad to be able to stand here to-night as representing an association which owes its origin to American initiative, and which therefore is fitly represented at this Peace Congress, an association which, beside its more ordinary — and shall I say humdrum? — labors for the assimilation of commercial and maritime law, in which it has done useful work, has always maintained the standard of international arbitration as a great ideal.

In commencing, will you allow me to say that I share the regret at the absence this evening of Mr. Andrew D. White, though indeed he could not have been better replaced [applause], because I have been looking forward to meeting Mr. White once more here. It was my privilege five years ago to go over to the Conference at The Hague on behalf of another organization, which I represent in this Congress, the Society of Friends in England, as a member of a deputation to seek to strengthen the hands of the Conference. Our first visit was to the charming and admirable president of the Conference, Baron de Staal, the Russian representative, but our next visit was paid to Mr. Andrew D. White. He received us with his invariable courtesy and affability.

And yet one more personal allusion may I make? The leader of our little Quaker deputation on that occasion was my old and honored friend, John Bellows, who was the friend of the great statesman whom you have just lost, Senator Hoar. Through him I knew something of the character of Senator Hoar, more than perhaps most English people did, and I should like just to lay my tribute of respect upon that grave, and to wish for the people of Boston and of Massachusetts that he may have many successors in the purity and blamelessness of his public life. [Applause.]

In the service which was held here on Sunday afternoon, which another engagement prevented me from attending, I observed that you repeated some words of an old familiar prophecy in these terms: "And God shall judge between the nations, and arbitrate for many peoples." I do not know where that translation comes from; it corresponds to a similar translation in the French language with which I was already acquainted, and represents, I believe, the true force of the original. The position of that verse in that wonderful prophecy which we have twice over, in Isaiah and in Micah, is a very remarkable one. It comes just before the prophecy with which we are all so familiar, especially those of us who attend peace gatherings — the prophecy of that time when they shall beat their swords into plow shares and their spears into pruning hooks, and nations shall learn war no more. It surely is a very wonderful thing that the ancient prophet, whichever of the two may have been the true originator of that grand old prophecy, should have seen, should have put his finger, so to speak, upon this very point — that in order to bring about a state of peace between nations, nations with their differing interests and their jarring notes, it was necessary there should be an institution of judgment, of justice, and that he should use the very word corresponding to our idea of arbitration. So what is coming to pass in our days, that which forms the subject of our meeting this evening, the constitution and work of the Hague Tribunal, is the fulfillment in our own days of this ancient prophecy of twenty-six hundred years ago. [Applause.]

It is to me very striking how that Conference at The Hague was led to do a work which nobody had expected from it. We who had already been interested in peace congresses and in this question of arbitration had for years been saying that we wanted a permanent court, something that should put an end to the merely provisional and temporary and accidental arbitrations that were happily growing in number and importance all through the last century. But the Hague Conference was not summoned with a view of establishing such a court, which most of us, I am afraid, had looked forward to as a dream that might be realized in some future time, but that we should hardly see in our own. It was summoned, you will remember, primarily to consider the question of mutual disarmament. It was only in the second circular inviting and more closely defining the functions of that Conference that the question of an arbitration court was introduced at all.

As you know, the Conference at The Hague was, to the disappointment of us all, unsuccessful in arriving at any result whatever on the question of the mutual reduction of armaments; but whilst on that point it failed, it achieved the wonderful success — I cannot ever think of it as anything else than a perfectly marvelous success — of constituting this Permanent Tribunal of The Hague.

It is not necessary, I suppose, here to go into the constitution of that Court, the admirable frame that was adopted, by which from a panel of men designated in advance, and who are almost certain to be free from any bias as regards the particular question that may be put before them — from such a panel of some of the wisest men nominated by the governments of the civilized world any two powers that may have a difference can choose those whom they think fit to decide their dispute.

What rejoices us as friends of peace particularly is that we see there the beginning of that which we have been pleading for so long, the beginning of organized peace, the beginning of a machinery which is to substitute the regular arbitrament of judicial procedure for the horrible, the cruel, the uncertain, the utterly unsatisfactory arbitrament of the sword. [Applause.]

Much remains yet to be done, much indeed before we see realized Victor Hugo's ideal of the United States of Europe, and still more before we get to that "federation of the world" of which Tennyson has sung.

But this is the first great step, and in it we cannot but rejoice. A distinguished English lawyer, Mr. M. Cranthorpe, in an article written three or four years ago, after the Hague Conference had taken place, on the history of international arbitration, after his explanation of this Court, and after saying that the Court has established a machinery for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, winds up in words to this effect,— that whilst machinery is most valuable, it is useless except there be a motive power put into it. Those magnificent steamers which cross the Atlantic, one of which brought some of my co-delegates and myself to your city last Friday morning — you may go and admire their machinery and their perfect adaptation for the great voyages, but until you have put water into the boiler, and heated that water into steam, of what use is the machinery for crossing the Atlantic? Now the machinery of which I am speaking needs the steam of public opinion. It is only public opinion, the opinion of the civilized nations of the world, that can make this Hague Conference machinery — beautiful and admirable as it is — of any real value. [Applause.]

I cannot help feeling that the first reference to the Hague Court was somewhat factitious. It was a little like what people have to do sometimes in the case of a pump; you put some water into a pump and then you make the pump work. [Laughter.] So President Roosevelt put water into the Hague pump, and he only got it agoing. But it is going, and not only have two or three disputes been referred to it already, but I want you to notice that far more important is this, that in those ten arbitration treaties which have characterized the last ten months, the Court at The Hague is specified as the tribunal to which disputes between these nations are to be referred. [Applause.] We need not be very anxious, I think, when that is the case, that there should be a great number of disputes for the sake of putting the Hague Court to work.

But now, going back to the metaphor, something more is needed than the little water in the pump, or rather something more than a little steam, to set and to keep the great engine of this steamer at work; the Hague Court needs the continuous and persistent force of public opinion; it requires that the people of our lands should determine that henceforth all disputes shall go to this great tribunal that has been constituted. And it is thus that you and I, every one of us, humble members of society, can do something to keep this machinery in motion.

After all, let us go back to the back of things. What we want is a better feeling between nations, more brotherliness, more recognition of the fact that man is man the world o'er [applause], that the circumstance that a man is born on one side or the other of some artificial frontier does not make any real difference. [Applause.] When by means of such congresses as this and other agencies we can spread this spirit of fraternity among the nations, then the Hague Court will get down solidly to its work, and then we shall see that peace will be organized permanently and surely. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I now have the pleasure of presenting to you Professor Quidde of Munich. He will speak to us in German, and Dr. Urban of Harvard University has kindly consented to give us in English a summary of what he says.

ADDRESS OF PROF. LUDWIG QUIDDE.

[It is to be regretted that no full stenographic report of this address in German could be had. It was one of the finest discourses delivered during the Congress, and the résumé does it scant justice. — ED.]

In an address of this morning the possibility of an American-German war was mentioned. Of course "yellow" papers in both countries are quick to set forth such a war as imminent. But none of the leaders think of it. I bear witness that nobody in my country has the least wish for such a war, a war which would be doubly dreadful as a conflict between friends and brothers. No power in the world will be able to force these two countries to take up arms against each other. [Applause.]

Our adversaries make fun of the peace movement and say: "The first success of the Hague Convention was the Boer war in South Africa; the second the Russo-Japanese war in Eastern Asia." This manner of judging our work is based upon a misunderstanding of the whole movement. Our plans are practical; we have no intention of declaring "eternal peace" to-morrow. We know very well that our work must be a development which will last years, perhaps centuries, before all causes of war can be uprooted.

The lines of our work will become clearer if we consider some historical facts. The whole progress of civilization consists in a gradual increasing of the sphere of law, and a slow but steady confinement of force within narrower and narrower limits. In this process consists the advancement of culture, as is shown by the history of law, although this process cannot be studied equally well everywhere.

In the beginnings of human civilization quarrels between individuals were allowed to be settled by force. This was called the right of feud, and a rudimentary form of it survives in the vendetta. Every man able to carry weapons could seek his right with the sword, the only restriction being that it must be his right. In those times feud was not a crime but a legal institution, and the punishment of the state consisted in putting the criminal outside of the King's Peace. Therefore those weird sentences in the old German codifications of law: nobody must shelter him, he must be a stranger all his life, and death follows his steps.

The first progress made was the bringing of the petty wars among the chiefs under certain laws, and the prohibition of them at certain times. According to different conditions in different countries this evolution was slower or more rapid. Germany suffered from the feud among the leaders from the time of Charlemagne, or perhaps the first Saxon emperors, until the time of the announcement of the King's Peace. As a matter of fact feuds lasted more than fifty years after the announcement of the King's Peace, but this act made an important change in the legal state, stigmatizing the feuds as crimes. Since that time violence between individuals has become unlawful. In our time the laws against individual violence exist, even if they are not always enforced; so the only possibility of lawful violence is war between nations. We are about to abolish this also.

If one of our ancestors had been told that the time would come when he would not be allowed to seek his right with the sword, he would have laughed and answered that that was impossible, and that life would not be worth living under those conditions. Nevertheless the world moves on, though we ride no more on mailed horses.

Our position in regard to war between nations is very much the same. We try to enforce certain laws of war on land and on sea, and to find out how war can be superseded. An important step towards this goal was the Convention at The Hague, which had two great results,— first, the organization of a permanent court of arbitration; second, rules and regulations for the proceedings of this court. By appealing to this court many conflicts may be avoided, and if there is a wish to settle a dispute by arbitration that wish may be gratified very easily. The further purpose of the peace movement is to change the present voluntary arbitration into obligatory arbitration. [Applause.]

In the name of civilization no sacrifice is considered too great, and every year new men are found who are willing to contribute to the advancement of human progress along this as along other lines. America and Europe boast themselves to be the leaders of the march of civilization, but, like beauty, civilization is, I fear, in many respects only skin deep. Hidden by a thin veneer there still exist the fierce instincts, which seem to be the inheritance of our time from our ancestors, and which furnish ready fuel for war.

Much has been done to abolish readiness for war, and it will be the business of the adherents of the peace movement to continue this work, the goal being the superseding of war by arbitration. In bringing about this happy consummation each one of us has his share to do. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I now have the pleasure of calling upon Dr. W. Evans Darby, Secretary of the British Peace Society, author of "International Tribunals," who has for many years chronicled with great pains every advance made in the cause of arbitration.

ADDRESS OF DR. W. EVANS DARBY.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Professor Westlake, one of our distinguished jurists in England and a member of the Hague Court, wrote me just before I left home for this meeting the following words: "I hope the Congress will consider the means of securing justice as the means to peace, by arbitration and otherwise." The motto of Grotius was "*Pax et justitia*," and the two, peace and justice, must go together between states as they must between men.

Perhaps a side issue of the thought I wish to follow will be to indicate how far the establishment of the Hague Court is a step in the progress of securing peace by justice.

Now I want to say frankly at the beginning that I do not share the opinion that nothing was accomplished at The Hague in the direction of disarmament. On the contrary, all that could be done in the present condition of the European states was accomplished. For a long time, as we have been more than once reminded, governments and the people they govern have been cheated by that old pagan idea that the best way of preserving peace is to be ready for war. Under the influence of that sentiment neither governments nor people would be ready to consider any proposal for disarmament without at the same time seeing their way to some substitute for what has been falsely called "the arbitrament of the sword." I maintain, therefore, that when arbitration as a substitute for war has been offered to the nations, and was actually established among men, *that* was the surest way of leading up to disarmament. [Applause.]

We have not forgotten — shall we ever forget? — that morning on which the proposal of the Czar fell upon the ears of the world like a bolt from the blue heavens, and was carried on the wings of the lightning round the globe, astonishing men everywhere. We had, as Mr. Alexander has reminded you, been dreaming for a long time of the possibility of some permanent establishment for the administration of arbitration. We had been working as well as dreaming. But no one ever expected that in the little lifetime of a single individual *that* would have been accomplished. And here were the words that set people everywhere thinking and filled them with expectation.

But people at once said, "This is a utopian idea; there is no practical proposal in it. Who will listen to any offer, any idea of disarmament?" I remember that the Archbishop of Canterbury,— the late Archbishop,— when asked to preside at a great meeting in London for the support of the idea broached by the Czar, replied: "There is nothing in it about arbitration, and without arbitration it is futile to talk of disarmament. I cannot waste time in discussing impracticable proposals, and therefore I cannot preside over your meeting." I ventured on that occasion to suggest to his Grace that while that at the moment was perfectly true,— the later circular mentioned arbitration, as Mr. Alexander has told you,— but that while at the moment that was perfectly true, no conference could be held for the discussion of disarmament without very speedily finding itself face to face with the other question of arbitration. And that proved to be the case.

Men objected to the proposal of the Czar that it said nothing about arbitration. The Hague Conference was held; a great treaty was formed by representatives of nine-tenths of the inhabitants of the globe, and the decisions of these delegates were ratified by their governments. And then, forsooth, we were told that the Hague Conference had accomplished nothing, because it had not settled some method of disarmament. Why, ladies and gentlemen, you can't settle disarmament by simple agreements, especially when governments show such wonderful facility in forgetting the obligations they have entered into by treaties. [Applause.] You want, as Mr. Alexander has reminded you, something behind the treaty, a high sense of honor. You want the sentiment of brotherhood; you want confidence between nation and nation. For if governments do not trust each other, the treaties they make are so much waste paper.

So I say again, the straight pathway to disarmament was the course adopted at the Hague Conference and the establishment of the Hague Court. [Applause.]

I want to make my thought as simple and forcible as I can. Let me try to do so by referring to a parallel which has been ingeniously drawn, and is founded upon historical fact. It has been pointed out that the course of history, with regard to private war, is being repeated in connection with public or international war. In the primary stages of society the individual had to fight for his rights, and to resent and revenge wrongs by the strength of his own right hand, aided perhaps by his relatives and friends, and then by the members of his clan. He claims to be the adjudicator of his own cause and to maintain his own rights. Later, as society develops, private war is put under restrictions. This is what has actually taken place in history; this is what is taking place in the current history of the world, for all these stages exist to-day side by side. In the later stages of society private war is put under restrictions, under rules. The old system of chivalry that belonged to the Middle Ages, referred to so eloquently by Professor Quidde, was simply the rules which society imposed for the conduct of private war. When you visit the old mother country, as I have heard you proudly call it here, you find dotted all over the land ruins of castles, picturesque, beautiful and suggestive — as suggestive as they are picturesque. What are these ruins? Why, the fortresses of the country gentlemen who possessed the right to make war upon each other. You will generally find them on the summits of hills. The reason for that is evident: the fortress should stand upon the hill and be made as inaccessible as possible. But they served another purpose, for round the foot of the hill were collected the huts of the retainers and dependents of these country lords. The fortress served a double purpose therefore, — it helped to keep in subjection the population that formed the town around the fortress, as well as to defend the lord against his neighbor on the opposite hill. So you frequently find in our old cities that peculiarity; Edinburgh, Sterling, and a number of other places that I might mention, are of that description,— the ruined castle upon the hill, the town still living, for the people outlived the aristocracy. [Applause.] You will find the same condition of things upon the Rhine, in that beautiful region where the ruins of the old castles with their legendary lore tell of a condition of things that has passed away.

But how did it pass away? Courts of justice were established, sometimes by the lords, then by the kings. The royal courts gradually gained strength. In that old time of the Middle Ages the king was not able to enforce his justice; but gradually, as these courts were appealed to, and their usefulness ascertained, even country gentlemen, instead of fighting each other in the valley between the hills on which their fortresses stood, came into court and their quarrels were there settled.

You know nothing of that, of course, in this newer country of yours, but that was how it came to pass, and to-day we have a system of what I will call intra-national justice. Of course it is a cumbrous thing, and a terribly expensive and slow one. But cumbrous and expensive and tardy though it may be, the present system of justice is infinitely better than the old one of private war. [Applause.]

Now if anybody had dared in those old days to protest that a time would come when private war would be done away with, he would have been looked upon as just as great a dreamer and as utopian as the people who are to-day talking of the end of public war.

But in England that old system of private war has passed away so entirely that even dueling is unknown. The duel, I am sorry to say, to some extent lingers elsewhere.

Now please note the stages: First, unregulated warfare, barbarous warfare; second, regulated war, subject to rules and conditions imposed by society, but still warfare. The next stage is courts existing side by side with the old method, being appealed to with greater and greater frequency, until by and by warfare dies out utterly and the courts are appealed to for the settlement of private quarrels.

Now briefly let me indicate the parallel furnished by public war. First of all, you have those old times when war was terribly cruel, and fought to the bitter end. We are growing too civilized now to indulge in war for any great length of time. Civilized nations fight up to a certain point, and then they think they have had enough and are ready to withdraw and listen to proposals of peace. But that was not always the case. The object of savage war was to destroy the enemy utterly.

The next stage is war between the Christian nations,— Christian war it is sometimes called, — when it is regulated, and subject to certain restrictions. Have n't we the Geneva rules of war? They mark the second stage.

But long ago we have reached the third stage, the stage in which the settlement of certain disputes by arbitration boards or tribunals has gone on at the same time that war has been a recognized method of adjustment. The cases of arbitration *ad hoc* have been very numerous. I have been amazed in studying the history of the subject to find how that method has been a part of the regular procedure in international relations to an extent that none of us have ever dreamed. It began when your American Independence was established. As soon as you had finished fighting the mother country, you began to form treaties of arbitration with her, and you have been doing it ever since.

The beginning of this modern period is the Jay Treaty of 1794, between the United States and Great Britain. [Applause.] In that treaty two or three arbitrations were provided for. And so it has gone on from that time up to the establishment of the Hague Court.

Now there are disadvantages connected with that system. It is not the best time to make provision for the settlement of a quarrel after it has begun, when passions are imflamed and each party is anxious to gain the victory, and believes that he is in the right. That is not the best time to choose your judges.

But in the Hague Convention what have you? Why, of course, the permanent establishment of a court of judicial arbitration. You see, we have got into the fourth stage already. In very truth the establishment of the Hague Court is the beginning of a new era in the history of the world. [Applause.] And you will accept it, I am sure, not as a mere compliment, but as a statement of simple historical fact, if I say that that accomplishment is largely due to you good people here in the United States.

I remember how Mr. Andrew D. White, who worked so nobly in the Hague Conference, told me that there was a period in the course of its proceedings when it was very doubtful whether anything could be accomplished in the direction of arbitration. The war lords of the world were not ready to listen to any proposals that would lessen their power or interfere with their purposes. But there came flashing along the wires, he said, from the New World the news of the many meetings that you held, meetings in your Christian churches and elsewhere, and there gathered such a body of public opinion round your representatives at The Hague that they took heart. And from that moment, Mr. White said, they felt assured that the result would be attained. Well, it has been attained.

When the old Hebrew prophets, Isaiah and Micah, uttered their memorable words about the nations learning war no more, nothing seemed more unlikely. The great world powers of that day were sweeping over all the lands of what was then the civilized world, carrying everything before them, defiant, proud, rejoicing in their might. Nothing seemed more unlikely than that the time would ever come when nations would cease to learn war. How is it to-day? The prophets looked into the future; they must have had a marvelous prescience, those men. They saw the better time when industrialism would take the place of war, when the nations would sheathe their swords, and even the learning of war would cease. To-day the nations are still learning war; throwing themselves into the preparation for it with an abandonment which threatens, in the eloquent words of the Czar's rescript, a cataclysm that makes every thinking being shudder with the bare anticipation of it.

But we have entered upon our fourth period. We have our established international court, which is to supplant war between nations as the municipal courts have supplanted private war. Your President never did a better service for humanity than when he declined the invitation extended to him to become arbitrator in the Venezuela trouble, and insisted that the question should go to the Hague Court. [Applause.] Here again your nation has rendered great service to humanity. It is in your power to do still greater service in the future if you let the aims and purposes of these peace congresses take full possession of you, and faithfully endeavor to secure their widest possible realization throughout the world.

The meeting then adjourned.

Christian Endeavor Peace Congress Rally, Park Street Church.

Tuesday Evening, October 4.

The church was filled to its utmost capacity when the Chairman, Rev. Francis E. Clark, D. D., called the meeting to order at 8 o'clock. The devotional exercises were led by Rev. J. J. Dunlop, pastor of the Roxbury Presbyterian Church. DR. CLARK then said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: It may need a single word of explanation to understand why this meeting is called the Christian Endeavor Rally of the Peace Congress. This Society has been honored in this way, I think, because it has had for one of its aims in years past to do as much as it could to hasten the day throughout the world of that for which this Peace Congress stands, international peace.

I was in London a short time ago attending the International Christian Endeavor Convention. I saw a great many meetings there which filled me with enthusiasm. I went into the building where the meetings were held and saw eight thousand young people assembled together for a praise service that was most uplifting and inspiring, and I felt the inspiration of what I there heard and saw. At other times I saw the City Temple and Exeter Hall and Westminster Chapel all crowded with enthusiastic audiences. Great as those occasions were, however, it seemed to me that the most memorable gathering of that Convention was not these great meetings in the great churches, but three or four hundred young people gathered in a committee room of the old Bailey; for these persons represented no less than twelve different nationalities of Europe. There were delegates from Germany, from France, from Finland, from Roumania and Russia, from Switzerland and Italy, and they had come together to form themselves into an International Christian Endeavor Brotherhood, to stand for peace, to stand for goodwill, to stand against war and everything that war means in their respective countries. A little gathering, you say; but I suppose that little gathering was the most significant of all those assemblies because it told of the idea that was regnant in the minds of millions of young people all over the world. It meant that the leaven is working, that the day of peace and goodwill is on the way, that the bloody centuries are of the past, and that we have entered, probably, on the last century of war, the century that will see the dawn of peace in all the world, the principle of the brotherhood of all men established everywhere.

Well, I ought not to stand between you and the distinguished speakers that are here to address you, even for a moment, and I will not do so longer. I have the very great pleasure of introducing for the first speaker the Rev. Richard Westrope of York, England.

ADDRESS OF REV. RICHARD WESTROPE.

Dr. Clark and Dear Friends: I want, in the few minutes allotted to me, to speak concerning the grounds of hope that we have for the world's future and for the world's peace from the standpoint of the Christian Endeavor.

The first ground of hope is this, that at no previous period of the world's history were there so many of the best souls in all nations who were avowedly disciples of Jesus Christ as at the present time. When we gather in our Peace Congress meetings during this week, it is a sight to see the men that are there and the causes that they represent. If we began to discuss church questions we should split up at once; if we began to discuss biblical questions we might go to pieces very speedily. But I venture to say that the one great uplifting principle of this Christian Endeavor association which holds us together is the fact that we recognize that the moral leadership of the world is in the hands of Jesus Christ.

I want to set forth clearly what this means. There stands out on the continent of Europe to-day,— well, perhaps several interesting, remarkable men, — but the most remarkable man on the continent of Europe to-day is Count Tolstoy. Count Tolstoy is remarkable for this: After attaining the very highest eminence as a *litterateur* and being widely known for the work he had done, when he had passed fifty he made the unexpected declaration that Jesus of Nazareth and He alone held the key for individual and social salvation. Since that period, what has he done? He has, by his pen, by story and writings of all kinds, brought the attention of the world to this particular point, that our only hope lies in listening to the voice and following the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth.

I remember that a short while ago a young American wrote a story. Of the literary merits of the work I have nothing to say. But when Charles Sheldon wrote "In His Steps," the world read it, and in all countries men asked themselves the question, "What would Jesus do?" I say our hope for the peace movement lies in this: That never since the first century have men been so eager to listen to His voice, and so anxious to see His will done on earth.

Now, if we want to know our duty, we go to Him. What does He teach? "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them." "It was said by them of old time, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy,' but I say to you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." Sometimes we are inclined to think that all the great spirits are in the past. We look around and say, "Where are the great men in literature, in the Church?" But let us not forget that the greatest of all centuries is with us still. Jesus Christ has conquered the world's conscience. He will conquer the world's heart. It is because He is our Captain and our King that we are certain that this twentieth century will be the greatest the world has known.

And then the second ground of hope lies in this: In no previous century was there such a sense of the solidarity of all men. And along with this overwhelming sense of solidarity, born of it, springing up out of its heart, is another kindred thing. The word for it is heard distinctly in our Peace Congress, a word that is on our lips and in our hearts, and that word we need not fear to speak out in a Christian church. That word is Socialism. If we look abroad to-day in Europe, do not let us be afraid, because all that is true in socialism is the direct fruit of Christianity and the Christian spirit.

I stand here to-night to speak for working men. For them I have given, in my own poor way, my life and my love and my service. I feel that as we look out broadly into the world to-day the attitude of Jesus is becoming the attitude of His followers. He had compassion on the multitude that went into the desert and gave them to eat. They were sheep not having a shepherd. There is a great field of service for us in this direction. There is an electric thread to-day that binds together the workers of all the world, the men who toil, the men who live hard and work hard and die, even, under dire conditions of poverty. For the first time in the history of the world the great mass of men have found consciousness, and they are turning their faces heavenward and asking for support.

Let us then recognize that our peace movement is part of a great human movement. God himself is in it. What has it given us? A new idea of the state; not the old idea of the state, as a policeman standing around to see that the fight is fairly conducted, but the new idea of the state as a coöperative commonwealth. It has given us a new idea of patriotism, — the idea of your own Lowell, that patriotism is more than the love of man for his own soil: that it is rather the love of righteousness and peace and brotherhood; that it is the recognition of the truth that every nation is a member of the great family of nations, with its own task, its own work to do in the world.

When the Socialist Conference met at Amsterdam, the Russian and the Japanese delegates fell on one another's necks and kissed one another. As the grand old Carlyle reminded us many years ago, if you take twenty men from Germany and twenty men from France from some unknown village, these men have no quarrel. There is no reason why they should go to war with one another. I know not how you feel here to-night, how the Congress feels, indeed, but I feel this: One great hope for the abolition of war lies in the new consciousness of a common humanity and a common interest that binds together the workers of the world. The time is coming when they will refuse to fight, because their sense of kinship will be so vital and deep.

One thing more. We may derive hope also for the future by looking back into the past. Looking back into the past, what do we find? That God himself, in the language of one of the old prophets, is watchful over His own purpose and will bring it to the birth. Go back into any century you like; it had its one great Christian movement. Some of you have wanted to become a St. Francis in this new day. Let us, indeed, have the simple life which characterized him. This, more than anything else, will reinspire the world. In the thirteenth century St. Francis perhaps saved Europe and civilization, and almost drove war from the very brains and hearts of men. Then came Luther and his reformation in the sixteenth century. Then, in the seventeenth century, there were great days in England, and almost greater days here, when men who prayed in secret laid the foundations for your great American Commonwealth, when men in England saw what the true genius of our nation and of your nation was: That it should stand for righteousness, stand alone, daring to speak God's word, daring to do God's will. Do not tell me that this twentieth century will be without its divine movement. It will be greater, vaster, diviner than any movement the world has yet seen, because it will take up into itself the social movement as well as the individual movement.

I see my time has gone. I want to-night to leave you a message from an elect soul. It is from John Bright, given to one who had a Bible class, who wrote to know what he should say to his men. Tell your young men this, he replied: "Link yourselves as early as possible with some great cause that has its conflict before it. If you do not help that cause, that cause will help you to your manhood. In helping that cause you will help yourselves still more." The greatest cause that calls you in this century is the cause of industrial and international peace. Link yourselves to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the speaker who has just addressed us so eloquently has told us the reason of the interest of many young people at this juncture in this great subject. It is because they feel the thrill of brotherhood with those whom they have learned to love in other lands, those who belong to the same organization, those who they feel, in some new sense, are their brothers; and we cannot fight our own brothers.

I now have the great honor to introduce to you the Rev. M. J. Elliott of Watlington, England, who will speak to us.

ADDRESS OF REV. M. J. ELLIOTT.

Dr. Clark and Dear Friends: I cannot express the unbounded gratitude I feel in looking upon this assembly. It has been my privilege to attend several Peace Congresses in various parts of Europe. Not until this year have I attended one on this side of the Atlantic. I venture to say that in no country of the world excepting my own and yours would a meeting of this kind be possible in connection with a Peace Congress. On the continent of Europe some of the most prominent peace workers are men who are opposed to Christianity, but it is because they have a wrong conception of what Christianity is. They are, in a large measure, following the Christ and doing His work, although unconsciously. They have been accustomed to what is called Christianity as a great power oppressing men and denying the simple rights of enlightenment and spiritual and mental liberty, and, having been compelled to think for themselves, they have thrown off the shackles of ecclesiasticism, and in doing so they think they have thrown off Christianity itself.

At one of our peace meetings in the city of Rome a few years ago a fiery Italian parliamentarian, speaking with great vehemence of the abominations of the ecclesiastical system, which alone he knew, said we must shake off Christianity, shake off religion, and from a humanitarian standpoint and on political lines bring about an era of universal peace and brotherhood. Before he had concluded his fiery declaration he seemed to reconsider, and he finished up by saying, "After all, you will never gain the peasantry and the working people except through the influence of the name of the 'Carpenter of Nazareth.'"

Our brother who has spoken first struck a high note. He has reminded us of our common brotherhood and our common Father. Whilst we are thankful for the coöperation of men like that one of whom I have spoken,—thankful for the great assistance they have given us in endeavoring to bring about a more desirable state of things, a kindlier feeling amongst the nations,—after all we shall never bring about the reign of peace until we subject ourselves to the authority of the Prince of Peace and follow his teachings.

I have a little story which many of you may know, which illustrates what I want to enforce. It is headed "A Remarkable Army Story." A party of Northern tourists gathered on the deck of a steamer which was moving down the historic Potomac one beautiful night in the summer of 1881. A gentleman, who has since gained an international reputation as a renderer of songs, had been delighting the party with the rendering of many familiar hymns, the last being that petition so dear to every Christian, beginning "Jesus lover of my soul." The singer gave the first two verses with much feeling and a peculiar pause on the concluding lines that thrilled every heart. A hush had fallen upon every listener. Then a gentleman made his way to the singer and said, "Beg your pardon, stranger, but were you actively engaged in the late war?" "Yes, sir," the man of song answered courteously, "I fought under General Grant." "Well," the first speaker continued, with something like a sigh, "I did my fighting on the other side, and, indeed, I am quite sure I was within sound of your voice one bright night eighteen years ago this very month. It was just such a night as this. If I am not very much mistaken, you were on guard duty. We, of the South, had sharp business on hand and you were one of the enemy.

I crept near your post of duty, my murderous weapon in my hand. The shadow hid me as you paced back and forth ; you were humming the tune of the hymn you have just sung. I raised my gun and aimed at your heart. I had been selected by our commander for the work because I was a sure shot. Then out on the night rang the words, 'Cover my defenceless head with the shadow of thy wing.' Your prayer was answered. I couldn't fire after that, and there was no attack made upon your camp that night. You were the man whose life I was spared from taking."

The singer grasped the hand of the Southerner and said, with much emotion, "I remember the night very well, and distinctly the feeling of depression and loneliness with which I went forth to my duty. I knew my post was one of great danger and I was more disturbed than any time I remember during the service. I paced my lonely beat thinking of home and friends and all that life holds dear. Then the thought of God's care for all that He has created came to me with peculiar force. If He cared for the sparrows, how much more for men created in His own image, and I sang the prayer of my heart and ceased to feel alone. How the prayer was answered I never knew until this evening."

My purpose in repeating this incident is to show you, by an object lesson, the absolute incompatibility between the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ and war. Our hope, our brother has said, is in looking back and learning lessons from the past. Our hope, as we look both backward and forward, is in the people, the class of people that we see before us this evening. Some of us were trained to think and believe that war was a necessity, something that was even right, in which Christian men could engage with perfect consistency, but some of us are beginning to see how diametrically opposed to everything that is of Christ the whole system of war is. We pray that the young people of to-day may have a clearer sight on the subject and may be led to understand these things in the true light of the Gospel, understand them as the Christians of the first two, or nearly the first three, centuries understood them : that to be a Christian was to be one that could not under any circumstances bear arms. "I am a Christian and therefore I cannot fight."

I pray that the young people of the Christian Endeavor Societies all over the world may be led to seek from Christ, from the teachings of His word, from the principles of His religion, what the true Christian position about war is. May the one bond of brotherhood which binds the whole race together never be forgotten for a moment, and we shall feel that because we are brothers, children of the one Father, we cannot hate and fight each other.

The Chairman : The next speaker, whom I take great pleasure in introducing, is Pastor Charles Wagner of Paris.

ADDRESS OF PASTOR CHARLES WAGNER OF PARIS.

Mr. President, *Ladies and Gentlemen:* I have learned English expressly for being able to speak to you, and I hope, seeing that I have used it only for six months, you will have for me a real American indulgence.

Where is the enemy whom we have to seek or against whom we have to fight? Where is war, and where have we to find the stronghold of war? That is the question. If we will destroy a fox we have to find his nest, and if the nest is found we can work with fire, with everything that is used to destroy a fox. Now, I hold that war is not in the voice of guns or cannon. War is not in the big strongholds in which warriors are hidden. War is not in the battleships. War is rather in the hearts of men, in ourselves. Here is the nest of that little fox, often of that great wolf [great laughter], and here we have to go and fight against him.

Every man has in his heart two kinds of mind. One is a hostile one, a bad one. This mind, if you meet your fellowman, thinks: In what way can I fight against my fellowman; what can I do against him? But the other mind is the mind of goodness, of brotherly feeling; and this mind, everywhere you meet your fellowman, says: What can I do for this man, what can I do to be agreeable and helpful to this man?

Now, by education we can produce one of these minds or the other; and I think the bad spirit, the bad mind, is very often, too often, bred by education, and I say it by experience. I am an Alsatian. I am of a country in which we have often been bombarded. I have clear memories of the sound of that conflict, which is not like the sound of the breath of spring, you may be sure, and I have watched often in the war and after the war the effects and the spirit which produced the war.

One day old Strasburg, the city of songs, of students, the city of goodwill, the city which could be a link between Germany and France, was under a fire of steel and of iron, and that iron fell not only on the walls, but on the private houses and even on the old and holy steeple of the Cathedral; and I saw the fire burning the old and venerable library of the new church,— English library,— where were hidden treasures of the human mind.

And after the war I heard the preacher preach in the pulpit: " Brethren, listen to me. Have you seen that old library of the new church burn, and also the new church burn in the same night, and no other church in Strasburg has been burned? Why? It is the finger of God." The old fox was hidden in that man. That is the spirit of war, to think and to have that mind that there are men worthy to be thrashed, to be killed, that there are libraries worthy to be burned and there are houses worthy to be spoiled. That is the spirit of war, to think that there are men worthy to be killed, and to think that one does the work of God in killing, destroying, crushing those men.

But we have another spirit, a new mind, the mind of goodness, the helpful mind. That is the mind of Christ. Christ has never put in this world a nation or collection of men worthy to be crushed. He came not to crush nor to destroy, but to be the Saviour of that which is lost; and He has a mind — oh, how beautiful and brotherly a mind! — which finds in every one what is good in him, what is the best in him.

The education of children must be looked after. Too often we teach to our children in schools that there are nations worthy to go down, to be crushed, to be destroyed. We must teach another teaching. We must teach to our children what is of good in every nation. We must show that every one has its place. We must be worthy disciples of Christ, who found, even in the darkness, a ray of light everywhere; and if we have this education, instead of teaching men to hate men, we teach men to love men.

War comes not only from the bad mind, but also from ignorance. Ignorance is darkness, and in darkness every one seems to be a robber, a thief or a wolf, and in darkness you are afraid, and fear is really a bad evil when it arises. We must give to every nation and to the children of every nation the brotherly love of other nations; and so I say in churches and in your Christian Endeavor Societies we must spread the very good spirit of Jesus Christ, which can establish in every man and in every nation what is lawful. We have to teach it. We are not pessimists. We are children of the Father, and we are the image of Christ, who has said, "Be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect."

That is my conviction, and I would you could put it in your mind. May we sow goodness and we shall have peace, instead of to sow the wind and to reap the storm.

The Chairman introduced as the next speaker Rev. Walter Walsh, Pastor of the Gilfillan Memorial Church of Dundee, Scotland, and author of "The Moral Damage of War."

ADDRESS OF REV. WALTER WALSH, OF DUNDEE, SCOTLAND.

Our English Wordsworth has told us in his most beautiful Ode that,

> "Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God who is our home."

The most beautiful aspect of youth is just that of the glamor with which it surrounds all human things. And in pursuance of that mental habit of youth, there is no kind of story that the young like so much to read as the stories of chivalry and bravery of the great days of old, of the bards and St. Georges and Arthurs of romantic history. How we have read and talked over the story of that Arthur, that surprising and beautiful allegory, which sets forth in a parable the quest of the Holy Grail, about which an American lady beautifully said to me to-day, "The Holy Grail is, after all, in the heart of man." I wish you would all read, if you read Tennyson any more, the beautiful legend of King Arthur, the Idylls of the King. There you will find the beautiful custom according to which Arthur made his young knights lay their hands in line and swear to reverence their conscience as their king, to speak no evil, no, nor listen to it; to love one maiden only, to cleave to her and worship her by noble deeds until they won her.

It is to this new chivalry that the Peace Congress invites the young manhood and womanhood of Boston. Christian Endeavor can assume no nobler form than the quest of that Holy Grail, the repression of human wrong which is connected with modern warfare, the uplifting of the mind, and its emancipation from all forms of political, social, religious and individual sin. We are not yet so far advanced from the age of barbarism, none of us as yet have come up so far from the primeval past, that we are not stirred by the sound of battle, that we do not feel our pulses leap and our hearts throb; the equipage of war makes us thrill and there is not one of us but feels that under certain conditions he could fight.

For my part I belong to a nation of fighters. I belong to a people who sometimes, vaingloriously, say, "We were never conquered"; but I make no boast of that. I am here to say, in the name of the Peace Congress, and in the name of Him whom the Peace Congress desires to serve, that we are here to direct you to nobler chivalry and to higher forms of conquest. We are not here to eliminate, in one sense, the fighting qualities from the human heart, but merely to change their object. As was said in Tremont Temple on Sunday afternoon, we are here merely to change the object of that warfare, and to concentrate upon social and public as well as upon individual evils the forces of our nature and the accumulated powers of the Christian Church. Sometimes we are alarmed, some of us, perhaps, who have n't looked into this movement very deeply. We say, "Oh, very well, but if the peace movement makes progress what a lot of milksops we shall all be. How are you going to treat the present conditions which tend to create militarism and soldiery?"

I apprehend that Jesus Christ did not come to make milksops. Jesus Christ came to give us soft hearts, but I don't understand that He came to give us soft heads. I have no wish to see a manhood or womanhood that is weak and emasculated, but my ideal is a manhood and womanhood that would rather aid than kill, that has not the courage to be a murderer, but has the fear of daring to be a murderer. I am here to say that we only want to direct the youth of the world to those nobler projects to which I have already referred. What are they? Consider what are the losses and the wastes of war and you will find an answer.

Such is the extravagance of the war habit, such are the miseries into which it plunges us, more especially in the old countries to which some of us belong, war wearied and tax laden, such is the crying poverty in which multitudes of our people lie, and such are the burdens which we all have to bear, that it is impossible to adequately care for the great social and public interests which Christian civilization ought to provide for. All around the iron bound coasts of Great Britain hundreds of poor souls are perishing every year because there is no money to build havens of refuge. Thousands of battered old hulks who have spent their life in the service of humanity have to die of hunger because there is no money to pension them in their old and weaker years. Pitiful consumptives by the hundreds and thousands have to languish in sick rooms and pass away like weeds, because there is no money to build sanitariums, which might give them health and make them useful men again. The heartbroken, oftentimes by social injustice and iniquity, creep like vermin into garrets and cellars to die, because there is no money to sweep away the slums and to put them into healthful and happier conditions.

The whole tendency of our social life is downward, because of the money that is wanted, the three hundred million dollars that this year in Great Britain has been used for soldiering, and to build immense battleships.

Now, we want the young men to change all that, to come and give themselves to social service, to the service of peace, to the turning of those immense revenues and those immense armies of men into the social service, into saviours and not destroyers of society. It was this great message which our glorious Carlyle preached for a generation from the mountaintop to the British people, that they should regiment their workers, regiment their workless people, gather them into regiments and armies, and lead them out to the barren morasses of their country, there to plow and sow and plant and till, until the wilderness rejoiced and blossomed as the rose.

There are rumors, even in our country, of calling for universal military service, because our war makers are coming to the end of their resources. We do not grudge public service ; we do not grudge years of our life to the service of our country. We only grudge giving the years of our life to the service of our country when it means the destruction of other countries and the destruction and loss of our brothers across the frontiers. We are willing to be led forth in regiments to make the roads, to sweep away the slums, and to build up homes for our people, in which it will be possible for the little children to grow up in innocence and piety and virtue, and if our legislatures and governments will call upon our young manhood to go forth to this service, how gloriously and readily will they respond.

We wrestle not against principalities and powers as such; but against principalities and powers who are against the workers of the world; therefore the weapons of our warfare are not carnal. While there is ignorance in the world; while there is social immorality in the land ; while there is poverty in the land ; while there is degradation;

while children are contaminated and depraved and destroyed in their sweet flowerlike childhood,— so long should our young men give themselves to this Christlike service, and so long should our young women put the armor on their knights and send them forth to that more Christlike warfare.

May the time soon come when our womanhood will cease to be attracted by the glamor of a belt or a strip of gold; may the time soon arrive when our women will cease the indecency of crowding round the returned warrior, who, after all, has only done what a superior beast would do, rescued himself from certain death by a feat of valor; and will cease with their immodest osculations to salute those who have returned from butchery of their fellow-creatures.

Oh, you laugh, but I tell you this is a matter to weep for, that our womanhood should prostrate itself at the feet of the man slayer. May our womanhood give itself to the service of humanity, and send this manhood — this young manhood — out with blessings to the greater service of Jesus Christ and of humanity.

The Chairman then introduced as the last speaker of the evening Hon. Samuel B. Capen of Boston.

ADDRESS OF HON. SAMUEL B. CAPEN.

Christian Endeavorers: We have heard these distinguished speakers representing philanthropy and religion giving us in these eloquent words this great truth. I hope it will not seem to you a discordant note if I tell you of the new allies that are coming to the champions of the past, these men who have, themselves and their predecessors, been building this cause throughout the world for more than half a century.

I have been thinking these last few days of the remark I heard made at the International Arbitration Conference in Washington by a distinguished ex-member of Congress from Brooklyn, who said that it was only a few years ago that he made a proposition in Congress looking to arbitration and that it was received with sneers and ridicule. We have been making history rapidly during the last few years. President McKinley in his inaugural address laid emphasis on arbitration. We know very well how President Roosevelt has stood by this idea. We know that in the critical hour of the Hague Conference it was America that saved it from breaking down, and subsequently, when the Court was fairly launched, it was President Roosevelt that sent the first case to it and saved it from being an object of ridicule. We heard yesterday from Secretary Hay, — who we believe, in his high character and ability, is the greatest living diplomat,— where he stands on this great subject.

Yes, friends, the statesmen and the diplomats of this country are standing together for this great idea, and the only rivalry we are going to have is whether the King of England or the President of the French

Republic or the President of the United States shall do the most for international arbitration, shall do the most to bring about universal brotherhood.

But there is another ally, more recent still, which is bringing great aid to this cause. I refer to the business men of this country. It is only a few years ago that they cared nothing about this theme. That has all been changed. Our brother, in the opening address, told us of the growing solidarity of the race. We have come to the day in the history of the world when there are no foreign nations, but each nation is neighbor to every other. It took the King of England three days, we are told, to learn about the battle of Waterloo across the channel. A London merchant has recently sent a communication to British Columbia and received a reply in ninety seconds. When the first missionaries were sent to Hawaii it was ten months before a message came back of their safe arrival. To-day you can get a message in ten minutes.

As illustrating the small compass of the world under our modern inventions, the following incident is very instructive: By an arrangement that had been provided beforehand, so that the telegraph stations of the world were all connected, the President sent a New Year's message around the world. Leaving the key at Washington, the electric spark jumped the American continent; it darted under the Pacific; it appeared again on the Asiatic shore; it traversed the Orient; it flew across Europe; it plunged into Africa; it crossed to Australia and was back again in Washington in ten seconds! What a change is coming into the world! We have harnessed the lightning, and the cable has made the world only one-tenth the size it was fifty years ago.

What is the effect of this? If the war in the Far East had been fought one hundred years ago, it might just as well have been in the planet Saturn. To-day, we know everything that is going on in this far-off place. The history of the world is open to every one of us every day. We are become one nation, and what injures one injures us all. The Boxer outbreak, which lasted only three months in three provinces in China, stopped, practically, some of our Southern mills, and if it had gone on a little longer, they would have changed their machinery. A war three months in three provinces had that effect here. This world of ours is now so interlocked and interlaced, and its business has become so one, that whatever injures one injures us all; and business and capital are timid, and where there is war or rumor of war it plays havoc with them at once. I heard a great banker say a few months ago that the depression that had existed in financial circles was the direct outcome of the war in the East.

My second point is this: The business world recognizes that we have come to the economic age, when we are trying our very best at every point to save waste; and war is awful waste. We are so much one world that a loss at one point is a loss to the common assets of the world. You cannot destroy property in Russia or Japan without destroying some of the property in the whole world. We had a fine illustration of that in the great fire in Baltimore. People said: "This is a good thing for the people there. They have still their old contracts with the insurance companies." Did they? Forty millions of dollars went up in smoke. The insurance people had to pay forty millions of dollars. Did n't that reduce their dividends? Are n't those insurance companies less strong for the future? Russia spending five hundred millions a year without helping, but impoverishing, her people! The internal tax has gone up from thirty to forty per cent. Is n't the purchasing power of those people affected?

I saw a short time ago that the debt of England in the past few years had increased by the sum of eight hundred and fifty million dollars; her consols had been knocked down in price from one hundred and fourteen to less than ninety. The business men of the world are beginning to hate war. They are joining their hands with religion and philanthropy to stop this awful waste. Here in America this matter is meaning more to us than it did a few years ago. There was a time when our home market would take care of all our product. Improved machinery has changed this. We must now have new markets. The foreign trade of the United States has increased by sixty per cent. We have, in thirty years, gone from a creditor nation of the fourth class to the first rank. We were selling thirty years ago three hundred and seventy-five million dollars worth; last year one billion four hundred million.

Our business men are waking up to the consciousness that there is a side to this subject in which they are tremendously interested. Then there is another side to it. The standing armies of Europe are working mischief to us here. How? Every agriculturalist in Germany is said to be carrying a soldier upon his back. Suppose all the money that is being spent in Europe for armies and navies could be spent on education and internal improvement, these men set to work and given homes and farms of their own, and the money now wasted put to use in some other way. Would not the people of Europe be lifted immediately to a higher plane, and should we have emptied upon us here so many men who hate restraint and government, and who come over here to make trouble and expense for us?

My last point is the growing solidarity of the races, already referred to. A hundred years ago English was spoken by comparatively few people. Look at what is going on now. People from different nations are being educated here and learning the English language. Is n't it much easier to do business when the language barrier is out of the way? We have this great Y. P. S. C. E. institution training for Christ these men who are learning the English language and our literature. The world is in this and other ways being welded together. Dr. Clark here, a leader of young people, has inaugurated the great Christian citizenship movement of young people, and the new movement for the federation of those of different nations together in one brotherhood. Philanthropy and religion, the statesman, the diplomat, the banker, the manufacturer, and the young people of the world in this new Commonwealth, are coöperating in making a world-brotherhood, a power that will bring down everything that is in the way and make certain the realization of the angel's song, "Peace on earth, goodwill among men."

After a vote of thanks to the speakers and the singing of a hymn, the meeting closed.

Second Business Session.

Wednesday Morning, October 5, 1904.

The President called the Congress to order at 10 o'clock.

Mr. Mead moved that the following messages of greeting be cabled from this Congress to Europe:

To Frederic Passy, Paris: The International Peace Congress, at the largest and most hopeful session in its history, greets its grand old man, who has fought the good fight and kept the faith from the day of small things to the day of great things.

To Hodgson Pratt, London: The International Peace Congress in Boston, the greatest Peace Congress which has ever met, remembers you with gratitude and honor, and rejoices that you are present in spirit.

To Elie Ducommun, Berne: The Thirteenth International Peace Congress of one thousand members sends you its greetings and its heartfelt thanks for the years of efficient and untiring service which have brought such noble things to pass.

To Andrew Carnegie, Skibo Castle, Scotland: The International Peace Congress in Boston, the largest and most confident ever assembled, gratefully greets the builder of the Temple of Peace at The Hague and the generous and earnest worker for the world's just and rational organization.

The motion was unanimously adopted, and the messages accordingly sent from the Congress.

The President, who was obliged to be absent during the session, then called the Hon. Albert K. Smiley to the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Secretary Trueblood has some telegrams which he will now present.

Dr. Trueblood here presented a large number of telegrams and messages of greeting to the Congress, including a cablegram from Sir Thomas Barclay of London. These are all given or summarized by titles with other messages at the end of the account of the first business session.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask Dr. Trueblood, who knows her so well, to introduce the Baroness von Suttner, who has just arrived from Europe.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: It gives me great pleasure this morning to welcome to our Congress and to present to you the distinguished lady from Austria who has perhaps done more for the cause of international peace than any other living woman. [Applause.] I very much doubt if any man in any country can claim superiority over her in this regard. [Applause.] At the Hague Conference she had the honor of being the only woman invited to be present at the opening session. You have all heard of her great story, "Lay Down Your Arms," which has had such a powerful influence on European thought. This book has had large sales in this country; it has been translated into nearly all the languages of Western Europe; it has already gone through about thirty editions in German, and is probably more popular and more widely circulated to-day than ever before. She was the founder fourteen years ago of the Austrian Society of the Friends of Peace, which has done much for the promotion of the cause in that country. She has attended nearly all the Peace Congresses in Europe, and has wielded through both her speech and her writings a powerful influence in the changing of European public opinion.

The Baroness has honored us by accepting the invitation extended to her on behalf of the friends of peace in this country to be present at this Congress, and we assure her that during the month which she proposes to stay in the United States she will be welcomed everywhere she goes.

It gives me great pleasure to present to the Thirteenth International Peace Congress the Baroness Bertha von Suttner of Vienna, who will take a few minutes to extend to us the greetings of her society and her fellow workers in the Austrian Empire. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF THE BARONESS BERTHA VON SUTTNER.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am quite overwhelmed by this hearty reception, and I do not know in what terms I can thank you.

Owing to unforeseen impediments I have been late in joining this Congress, and I deeply regret that I was not present at its opening. But better late than never [applause], and I am glad that I have been able to come at all and to bring you the greetings of the societies I represent.

First of all, I bring you the greetings of the Vienna Society of Peace, which has existed now for ten years and has been growing every year. Many of our friends would have liked to come, but the circumstances did not permit it, and so they have conferred the honor upon me of representing the whole society, to which many prominent persons in Austria belong.

Then I am the delegate of the Society of Peace of Hungary. I bring a message, too, from the Academical Peace Society of the University of Vienna.

I wish I could express how elated I feel to find myself here among many old friends, and let me hope amongst a few new friends, too [applause], in so distant a part of the world. It makes one feel conscious of the happy fact that our movement is encircling the world, the New and the Old. The New World, I know well, was the cradle of the movement; and after all I have heard and seen in the few minutes that I have had the happiness to be among you, I can well believe that the New World may also bring its crowning work.

These were the thoughts which gladdened my voyage over the ocean; and one good feature of that voyage certainly also was that a few days elapsed without news from the outside of what is going on in this sad world, and without hearing from those interesting moves on the checkerboard in the Far East where the play means death and unutterable suffering to thousands of our fellow creatures, and where horrors so ghastly and of such gigantic proportions are being perpetrated that one feels ashamed to be a citizen of our present world. [Applause.]

But I dare not detain you longer from your work, which means the prevention of such horrors, and I only ask your permission to join you. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: It gives me great pleasure to present to you Rabbi J. Leonard Levy of Pittsburg, Pa., who will say a few words in the name of his people.

RESPONSE OF RABBI J. LEONARD LEVY, D. D.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: A few moments ago the Chairman of this meeting asked me if I would bring to this Congress a word of greeting from the people to whose religious faith I belong. I could not resist both the honor and the temptation to say a word to this very distinguished body, a word both of congratulation and a word of the deepest gratitude for the work in which you are engaged. For if there is one people above all peoples to whom the cause of peace is sacred and is to-day bringing a message of hope, it is the people of Israel. [Applause.]

Twenty-six hundred years ago the prophet of Israel dreamed a dream, which as far as human civilization will permit has become realized in the Congress now in session in Boston. He said: "In the fullness of time swords shall be turned into plow shares and spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

It may be that in his day that man was obscure, unknown, regarded as one of the faddists or cranks of his time. But faddist or crank, it is his thought, his hope, his ideal which has been the means of bringing about the Thirteenth International Peace Congress.

I desire this morning as a Jew, as an Englishman by birth, as an American by adoption, and above all, as a human being [applause], as a man to emphasize what Sherman meant when he said, "War is hell." He did n't begin to depict properly the monstrousness of the evil. War is fratricide; war is the murder of brother by brother.

If there is one message which has come to us from the Good Book which we all especially prize, it is that there is but one God for all of us; one Father who made all of us; and that Father, in creating the human spectrum of the white man, the black man, the red man, the brown man and the yellow man, decided that the five colors must blend into one color in the spirit. [Applause.] When any man raises the gun or the sword against his fellowman he is raising the sword or the gun against his own brother, made in the image of his own Father. And every war, whether it be between Russia and Japan, or between members of the same race, is fratricide.

While to-day we speak so eloquently of the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man is still referred to in a very hesitating way. It must go forth from this Conference that war is a game of red and black — red with human blood and black with brutal hate. We must teach this; the pulpits, the schools must teach it, if our cause is to conquer.

We have all read the old story of how the good fairy comes with her wand and changes the brute into the prince. My friends, the good fairy is here to-day; the good fairy is the International Peace Society, which holds up the wand which when it can reach the hearts of the brutes among men will convert them into princes with God.

I bring you greeting, my friends, with great respect and with intense interest in your movement.

The Chairman: It gives me great pleasure to present to you Baba Premanand Bharati from Brindaban, Northwest Province of India, who will speak briefly to us.

RESPONSE OF BABA PREMANAND BHARATI.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am most proud of the privilege of attending this Congress of peacemakers. "Blessed are the peacemakers," said the Lord Jesus Christ. "Twice blessed are the peacemakers," say our sacred writings. I come from the holiest of holy lands in India, where the holy lamas sit sending vibrations of peace and love to the whole world.

I come before you with a very little request, now that you are going to have your deliberations for the cause of the peace of the world. I beg most humbly to submit to you the matter of the grievances of a very innocent people, I mean the Thibetan lamas.

I belong to the jungles; I have come from the jungles, I will go back to the jungles. I do not belong to the world or society or family or home. I am a servant of the lamas, of the holiest lamas of India, and therefore I feel for these lamas of Thibet. They have kept the world outside their holy kingdom so that they may pursue their philosophical and spiritual avocations, and send blessings from the roof of the world to all the world. They have gone to the roof of the world not to be molested, and yet the curiosity of civilization has destroyed all their peace.

The English government have been wheedled into this thing. The English did not want it; the Indian government did it; and the government in England has been wheedled into it. Everybody knows it. When Secretary Hay made that little inquiry — blessed be his name! — one little ray of hope was excited in the breast of every Asiatic. For every Asiatic loves the lamas because of the peace that they work by their spiritual vibrations all over the world.

Now it has been accomplished, and you know the story of the massacre there. But I ask all who have come here for the cause of humanity to do something that these poor peaceful, spiritual men may again be allowed to pursue their holy work.

Another point — about this Japanese-Russian war. Nobody regrets it more than a Hindoo, who believes in peace, and harmony and love. I hope that in your deliberations you will try to see that the causes of war between the East and the West may be removed. I think prevention is better than cure. [Applause.] There are two causes. One is that you want to thrust your civilization upon us, and the other is that you want to thrust your religion upon us. We say Jesus is great. We read the Bible and see the divinity of Jesus in it, and we bow our Oriental heads in reverence. Wherever there is holiness, wherever there is divinity, we bow our heads in reverence. Therefore, however much our Christian brothers may call us heathens, we don't call them heathens. [Applause.] We say that this word "heathen" should be blotted out from all your dictionaries.

You have developed a wonderful civilization; but think of the old civilization of Asia, study it and see the foundations of your civilization. Japan has taken your civilization and placed it upon the old foundation. If you want to thrust your civilization upon us, do so, but do not try to destroy our foundations. You cannot destroy our foundations, they are as old as creation.

These are the two things that bring us into conflict. I hope that the Congress will consider these points, — that we must not be called heathens in our own land; our God must not be denounced; we are not barbarous; our land has been the parent of all civilizations.

With these words I bring to you the greetings of all my countrymen, Hindoos, and all Asiatics.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have only one more person to speak bringing greetings, after which we will proceed to the regular business of the morning. I wish both Russia and Japan had representatives here to speak to each other in loving greeting and join with us in this great peace movement. We have, however, one gentlemen from Russia, and it gives me great pleasure to present to you Dr. M. Chirurg, who will now address us for three or four minutes. [Applause.]

RESPONSE OF DR. M. CHIRURG.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I come here to represent Mr. Novikow, the delegate from Russia, who unfortunately is absent, and I bring to you his greetings and the greetings of my fellow countrymen in peace.

I will not take up your time, as I am informed that the time is very short for business purposes. I will say that the people at large in Russia are in peace as much as those that are present here. Otherwise I wouldn't be here with you. And I will say that if there is here a man from Japan who is a member of this Congress, I as a Russian will extend to him my hand in welcome, as a fellow man and as a friend of peace in general. [Applause.]

I thank you all for your kind reception.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now call for reports from the committees. Dr. Darby has a report to present from the Committee on Current Events, Committee A.

DR. DARBY: I have the honor of presenting the report of Committee A on the Russo-Japanese War. I think it is right that we should face this question boldly at the very beginning of our work, and that we should make some response to the unspoken challenge of public expectation. [Applause.]

The Committee have prepared two resolutions, which I have pleasure in submitting to you. They are as follows:

Resolved, That the Congress address to the Emperors of Russia and Japan an earnest appeal, entreating them, either by direct negotiations or by having recourse to the friendly offices of some neutral power or powers, to put an end to the awful slaughter of their subjects now going on, and urging the plea that since terms of peace must sooner or later be discussed and settled, it is far better that this shall be done promptly so as to avert the further sacrifice of precious lives and valuable property.

Resolved, That the Congress forward an address to each of the powers signatory of the Hague Convention, other than Russia and Japan, reminding them of the provision of Article 27 of the Convention, and urging them, in accordance therewith, to press upon the governments of Russia and Japan the importance of putting an end without further delay to a war which afflicts humanity, hinders legitimate commerce, and impedes the progress of the world in the pathway of civilization and peace.

That, as your endorsement implies, is so obviously the word which needs to be said at the moment that these resolutions will require no elaborate argument in their support.

Terms of peace, of course, must be settled sooner or later; no war could be continued without end; and those of us who have had the high privilege of pleading the cause of peace have been trying to say to the multitudes what is too obvious, that it is far better to have the discussion before the conflict than to have it afterwards. That cannot be the case in this instance, so I think we are quite right in calling the attention not only of the emperors of Russia and Japan, but of the whole civilized world, to the fact that since there must be a settlement sooner or later, it is far better that it should be reached promptly so as to avert the further sacrifice of precious lives and valuable property.

The Chairman, at the great meeting held here last night, called attention to the significance of Article 27 of the Convention signed at The Hague. Now, what we propose to do in our resolution is to appeal to that Article. For, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think that we can repeat too frequently the appeal to the powers signatory of the Hague Convention to be loyal to their obligations. Governments mean, or ought to mean, what they say, and if they enter into agreements with each other it is expected that they shall carry them out. [Applause.] Therefore, again, we do right in appealing to the powers signatory of the Hague Convention to take advantage of the provisions of Article 27, which says that any proffering of good offices shall not be considered hostile, but a friendly act. This is what the resolution asks you to do. I am not tempted to make it a peg on which to hang a speech, and content myself with simply presenting on behalf of my Committee the two resolutions.

MR. L. A. MAYNARD: It has been a great surprise to me that the nations do not avail themselves of the provisions of Article 27 of the Hague Convention, and I wish to ask if any of the powers have done so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can any one answer that question?

MRS. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD: Secretary Hay has intimated to the belligerent powers that the good offices of the United States would be given, if welcome.

SIGNOR E. T. MONETA (interpreted by Mr. Adolphe Smith): Signor Moneta says that he will vote for the resolution, but he fears it will not do much good. Action similar to that indicated was taken by the International Peace Bureau at Berne at the beginning of the war, and it led to nothing whatsoever. He thinks it something like calling the doctors in after the patient is dead.

Yet we must act and go forward. We are told that we are a failure, that we have n't prevented war. The war in the Far East shows that it is the imperialist spirit which is a failure. In Italy the peace party stopped the war with Abyssinia after Italy had been defeated. There is a false sense of military honor which says that after you have been defeated you must keep on till you gain a victory. Well, the Italian Peace Society, many of the members of which are old soldiers, forced the Italian government to cease the war after it had been defeated. [Applause.] In this they were materially assisted by the women and children, who went out bodily and stopped the soldiers who were starting for the war. [Applause.]

There ought to be one government that would have our spirit and our ideas and act with similar energy, and if necessary one or two other governments should follow its example. If, for instance, the United States were to interfere energetically, and were followed by France and England, the three governments together could compel the Japanese and the Russians to resort to peaceful negotiations.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from Mr. William Randal Cremer, M. P., of London.

MR. CREMER: I hope and believe, from the feelings evinced in regard to the resolutions which are now under consideration, that they will be agreed to unanimously.

I only rise for the purpose of stating that this is not the first time that an effort has been made in this direction. A gentleman in the body of the hall just now asked the question as to whether any efforts had been made by the friends of peace in any part of the world to prevent or stop the war between Japan and Russia. I am very glad to be able to state, what is probably not known to many in this Conference, that before the war began an effort was made by the International Arbitration League in England, and I believe by the Society of the Friends of Peace in France, to try to prevent the conflict. A memorial was prepared by the Arbitration League, signed by I think as representative a body of men and women as could be found in the whole of Great Britain. There were Peers, and Members of the House of Commons, and of the bench of bishops, and others of the most learned and able men throughout the United Kingdom. It was not an extensively signed memorial; it was a very select and influential body that signed it; and it was sent in the form of a telegram, with the names of all the signatories appended, to the Czar of Russia and the Mikado of Japan. Mr. Stead joined us in that effort, and we did our very best for several days; we took the telegram to the embassy of Russia and to the representative of Japan in London, and it was transmitted through their agencies, and we did our best to prevent the war.

I am afraid — and I confess it with some shame — that the British government was largely responsible for that terrible conflict. Some of us in the British House of Commons had the courage to express the opinion, when the treaty was concluded between Japan and Great Britain, that a serious mistake had been made. I do not charge the British government with having deliberately made that mistake; nevertheless, I believe it was one, and a very serious one, and a blunder, if not a crime. The war would never have been entered upon so precipitately by Japan if she had not known that one of the conditions of the treaty entered into by Great Britain and that country stipulated that in case Japan engaged in a conflict with any power and was then attacked by another power, Great Britain should come to her assistance. That induced Japan, in the opinion of a growing number of people in the United Kingdom, to precipitate the war, to engage in that horrible conflict with Russia, a conflict which I believe would have been avoided but for that unfortunate treaty.

I merely rise to state that it is due to the friends of peace in Great

Britain and France that this Congress should be made aware of the fact that before the war began an effort was made of the nature and character to which I have referred. Although we failed at the time to prevent that war, I think it is the duty of the friends of peace here and all over the globe to still continue efforts in this direction, and to try to stop the most horrible conflict which the present generation has witnessed. [Applause.]

PROFESSOR QUIDDE: Right things should be done at the right time. Any intervention for stopping the war has, at the present time, little chance of success. The resolution should be handed over to the Berne Peace Bureau, which, at a favorable opportunity, should deliver it to Russia and Japan, and to the other powers.

DR. G. B. CLARK: I quite agree with my friend that probably this appeal will not be heeded now. But there is one thing that we all ought to bear in mind, that the question at issue between those two powers cannot and will not be allowed to be settled by either the one or the other. The question affects Manchuria and it affects the empire of Korea. It is perfectly clear that neither Japan nor Russia can settle the fates of these millions of people. It is time that we in asking for peace should also state the rights of the case, the rights of the people of Korea and Manchuria.

We ought to tell the Emperors of Russia and Japan that this question cannot be settled by force; that it can only be settled upon the lines of an international agreement, not a European one alone, because America also has rights in those great territories, and rights that she will maintain. We must point out to both parties the absolute folly of the course they are pursuing, because the question at issue can only be settled by a full consideration of the rights of all the various countries.

MR. J. G. ALEXANDER: I must say that I feel absolute sympathy with what Dr. Clark has said as to the ultimate settlement of this question, yet at the same time I think that it would be weighting the resolution unduly, and that it would be unsafe and undesirable to introduce any of those matters into it. The resolution should stand as it was drawn, a simple appeal to the powers in behalf of peace.

MR. G. H. PERRIS: I rise to make a suggestion which I hope will give point to this resolution. It is utterly distasteful and horrible to me that we should sit here in our comfort, in comparative coldness of blood, while at the other end of the world there is being pursued the most horrible combat; while trenches are being captured, with awful slaughter, from Japs by Russians and from Russians by Japs; while men are dying in hospitals and in every way, and an earth that might be a heaven is being made into a hell. I hope we shall pass these resolutions, and show by the unanimity with which we pass them that we are expressing the feeling of the heart and mind of the whole Congress.

I want to suggest that in order to give these resolutions a further chance of effective operation, the second one be presented at Washington to President Roosevelt by a deputation representing this Congress. Whether President Roosevelt will receive such a deputation I do not know. I venture to think that it will be the test as to his desire to help forward the peace of the world. Personally I believe that when the telegram goes from this Congress — if it does go — asking him to receive the deputation, there will be a return telegram, agreeing to see that deputation immediately.

I think it is important that such a deputation shall go to President Roosevelt, because I think the method of this peaceable intervention is of the utmost importance. My own view is that which was suggested by Signor Moneta, that the best possible approach to the question would be in the first place that the government of the United States should move those governments which are formally the allies of the two belligerent powers -- France, on the one hand, the ally of Russia, England, on the other hand, the ally of Japan. If the United States, if it were possible in conjunction with the German government, would give the mandate which those two great countries would be able to give, not simply to the belligerents, but also to England and France, there would not only be no complaint against such intervention, but it would be irresistible. It would represent the combined pressure of the four strongest countries of the world. While intervention by a single power might be immediately rejected, intervention by those four powers, regularly based upon Article 27 of the Hague Convention, would be absolutely irresistible and would have the strongest chance of any possible measure to bring an end to this war.

The possibility of such a stoppage is not as distant as some of our friends seem to think. I was over for a short period this summer in Moscow, and I am absolutely certain from the inquiries I made that the heart of the Russian people is not in this war. [Applause] I will not say anything about Japan, which I do not know, but we hear and we see a great deal of the intelligence of Japan, and if the intelligence of Japan does not at this moment demand peace, then indeed it is a poor quality of intelligence. [Applause.] For myself, I believe that though we have not got here in this body Russians and Japs, the strongest and most numerous part of this Congress is the spirits of Russians and Japs who to-day beside their firesides are demanding and praying for the peace of which we are speaking. These people are with us, and their necessities demand peace.

I desire to move the following resolution :

> " That the representations in the second of these resolutions shall if possible be presented by a deputation to the President of the United States, and that the Chairman and Secretary of the Organization Committee are desired immediately to make the necessary arrangements."

Col. Pryce Jones, M. P.: I rise to say but a very few words, and I am sure you will not blame me for rising. My friend, Mr.

Cremer, a very respected member of Parliament in England, has, I think, made rather an unfortunate slip. I do not think that he meant what he said. He blamed the British government for the alliance with Japan. [Applause.] Now, ladies and gentlemen, both the Government and the Opposition approved of that alliance. Russia had an alliance with France, and it was made with the intention of maintaining the peace of the world. I say in this hall to-day that both the Unionist government and the Opposition in England are in favor of peace. Our Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition are both lovers of peace, and are only too pleased, only too ready to join this great country in doing all we can — as we have done before the war, and now the war is on — to put an end to the strife.

HON. JOHN LUND: There has been spoken so much about this resolution that I will only add a few words. I quite agree with Signor Moneta and Professor Quidde that it is not advisable to go on with this resolution. When Russia and Japan get such a document from us, they will not take any notice of it. It seems to me only to give the impression of sentimentalism, as if we were trying to do things that are impracticable.

My friend from London has proposed to go to President Roosevelt and ask him to ask some of the great powers of Europe to make intervention. This is quite another thing; it is practicable.

DR. MAGILL (ex-President Swathmore College): I sincerely hope that this body will do nothing to express any views whatever in regard to the origin of the dreadful war going on in the East, whether one side is to blame or the other. I think we had better not go into that question. But we ought to express ourselves in terms most unequivocal, as is done in these resolutions. I do not see how we can improve on them. We certainly ought not to break up a great assembly like this without having made an expression of our feeling about that conflict. One suggestion has been made which I believe I would be willing with some modifications to accept — that this resolution should get to the powers in some way through President Roosevelt. [Applause.]

MRS. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD: Why not ask all the powers signatory of the Hague Convention to send a joint note to the Emperors of Russia and Japan? You can break the strands of a rope when you cannot break the rope itself. If all the signatory powers be asked to send a joint note, the war can be stopped without feeling on either side, or any side. [Applause.]

MRS. JULIA WARD HOWE (who was received with great applause, the whole Congress rising): *Mr. President and Dear Friends of the great cause here most happily assembled:* There is one word which I would wish to hear oftener in conjunction with this holy word peace. It is a word as holy, but it is anterior, I think, in our labor, and that is, justice. [Applause.] If we undertake to intervene, as I wish indeed that we might, in this terrific struggle, we ought to be able to assure the combatants on both sides that justice, and not convenience, will be the thing that will first be considered.

We talk a great deal about the Hague Tribunal as a great instrument of peace, and so it is. But we want more than that,— we want to be assured that it will be a great agency of justice; and that the best intellect of the world with the best training shall be employed in these delicate and intricate cases to secure that justice without which there can be no peace. [Applause.] For it is a noble instinct in human nature which rebels against injustice. It is a divine instinct, and one against which we must not war, which we must not in any way frown down.

Surely a tribunal so honest as this ought to be, and is likely to be, and perhaps is, should represent that primal instinct of human nature. The tribunal should be able to appeal to high heaven and say, "Our decision is the decision which heaven itself inspires us with." [Applause.]

Dr. Chirurg: I wish to say that as I have heard so many Englishmen speak, — and as we all know England is the ally of Japan, — I thought it would be proper for me to say a few words for the truth from the standpoint of Russia.

I heard mentioned that France is an ally of Russia, and that is why England has become an ally of Japan. It is true, probably, that France is an ally of Russia, but not for the purpose of war. It is for the purpose of the balance of power in Europe. Therefore I felt it my duty to bring before you the truth that Russia has France as an ally not for the purpose of attacking Japan; but as soon as Japan was assured of the alliance of England she attacked Russia, while the Japanese representatives were still enjoying hospitality in Russia. And from all the reports we have heard we can well believe that Russia was not prepared for war.

Let us go back a little and see who called the first Conference at The Hague. Was it not the Russian Czar? And I will say with the gentleman who spoke previously, who has been in Moscow, — I will say the same, for I am in correspondence with gentlemen, classmates of mine in Russia, military men, also civilians, and the Russians generally are for peace.

I am here all alone representing Russia, not as the Englishmen of whom there are many members of Parliament here, and I simply wish to make the statement as a fact that Russia generally is for peace. [Applause.]

Prof. Th. Ruyssen (interpreted by Mr. Smith): Mr. Ruyssen wishes to say a word in this debate; since most of the nationalities have already spoken, he wishes to speak in regard to the possible attitude of France.

He thinks that an appeal made directly to Russia and Japan will in the present circumstances avail nothing, but he does not wish the matter to be handed over to the Berne Bureau for the Bureau to act when a propitious moment arises. No, he thinks that such an important Congress as this cannot do otherwise than is proposed; it is in duty bound to take action itself, and action at once. [Applause.]

He does not think that the French government is likely to take the initiative in the matter. The very fact that France is in a way allied to Russia renders it very difficult for her to take the first step. In any case, any step that French diplomacy may adopt would and should be taken in perfect accord with the diplomacy of the government of Great Britain. France and Great Britain must not be separated over this matter. [Applause.]

But it is difficult for France or Great Britain to take the initiative. The one government of all others which is best placed to take the initiative in this matter is the government of the United States of America. He therefore strongly endorses the proposal of Mr. Perris.

MR. ALFRED H. LOVE: I take great pleasure in commending the action of the Committee and approve of the resolutions. I think that this is no time for us to criticise the action of Great Britain or of any other government. That is a matter of the past. Let us do what we can toward putting an end to this direful war in the East. Justice, equality, the brotherhood of man, are all demanding that we pass these resolutions and present them as speedily as possible through a government that is in unity with us. We may make it possible to stop this terrible war. Let us ask for peace; peace is the sum of all the virtues.

The Secretary then read the three resolutions again and said:

It is proposed that the first resolution be cabled to the Emperor of Russia and the Emperor of Japan, and that the second be transmitted in regular order, either by the President and Secretary of this Congress or through the Peace Bureau at Berne, to the other signatory powers.

The two resolutions introduced by Dr. Darby from the Committee and the one proposed by Mr. Perris were then adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is another report ready to be presented from the Committee on Current Questions. This report is on the question of Alsace-Lorraine, or the matter of reconciliation between France and Germany. The proposition that the Committee has to make is probably one that will arouse little discussion, and we ought to get through with it in a few minutes. The report will be made by Senator Houzeau de Lehaie of Belgium.

MR. HOUZEAU DE LEHAIE: *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* The question I am requested to report upon is a very important one and a very difficult one, and as I am not master of English I will speak English as much as I can, and speak in French when I cannot find the word in English.

It is well known that the relations between the French and the German people are not as friendly as we would desire. The last Universal Peace Congress asked the Berne Bureau to make a study of the subject and get together all the information possible on the question. If we had to read all the papers which the Bureau collected I think it would be very difficult to come to any action in this meeting. The Berne Bureau therefore has made a short report, saying that it has not been able to collect all the information necessary, and hopes to be able to get some more information by next year.

The Committee, therefore, proposes to the Congress the adoption of the following resolution :

> "The Congress having considered the report addressed to it by the International Peace Bureau at Berne, dated July 27, 1904;
>
> "Considering that the Twelfth Congress had already charged the Berne Bureau to study the points necessary to a Franco-German agreement, and that this mandate of the Berne Bureau should be defined and completed;
>
> "Requests the Bureau to elect from among its members a committee which, after a preliminary inquiry, shall co-ordinate the results and present a circumstantial report to the next Congress, explaining the situation of the two peoples in modern international law and the best methods of producing a friendly and juridical agreement, on which the Congress shall decide upon the practical steps to be taken."

DR. TRUEBLOOD: May I say in explanation of the course which the Committee has taken, that I received some six weeks ago a memorial from the German Peace Societies forwarded by Dr. Richter, and also one from the French Peace Societies forwarded by Mr. Frederic Passy, requesting in behalf of the workers in those countries that we should not attempt at the Congress in this country to make any declaration upon the question of Alsace-Lorraine, but that it be submitted to a committee to study for the coming year.

The Committee have had before them these memorials from the two countries, and in their report have recommended the carrying out in this respect of the wishes of the German and French delegates. I see no other course for us to take than to send this subject back to the Berne Bureau and to ask the Bureau to create the Committee suggested, which shall make a report next year.

The resolution was adopted unanimously, and the meeting adjourned.

On Wednesday afternoon from 4 to 6 o'clock a reception to the delegates was given by the Mayor of Boston in the Public Library building.

Public Meeting in Tremont Temple.

Wednesday Evening, October 5.

THE INTEREST OF BUSINESS MEN IN THE CAUSE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

President Paine called the meeting to order at 8 o'clock, and said:

This meeting is called in behalf of the business interests, to let them speak their word in this great cause of peace. I know no more promising side of the progress of the cause than the interest which throughout America, in England, in France and other countries business men have begun to take in it. It is eminently fitting, therefore, that the presiding officer this evening should be one of the successful and honored business men of Boston, and I shall ask to preside over this meeting the Hon. William H. Lincoln, ex-Chairman of the International Arbitration Committee of Massachusetts, and ex-President of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

REMARKS OF WILLIAM H. LINCOLN, ON TAKING THE CHAIR.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I confess to a feeling of embarrassment in finding myself in this position. It was only at noon to-day that I was summoned to preside at this meeting; but I felt it was incumbent upon every business man to do his part in forwarding the interests of this great cause, one of the greatest causes in the world at this time.

As this meeting has been called especially in the interest of the business men of the community, it may be desirable to present some facts in connection with the history of this movement. For business men and organizations act more upon facts than upon theories, and therefore it is that their action procures recognition and influence.

The cause is making notable and satisfactory progress. Our note is not one of discouragement, but of confidence and faith. The first International Peace Congress was planned in this city and held in London in 1843. Since its meeting in 1903 ten European nations have signed arbitration treaties pledging reference to the Hague Court. The mere fact of a world court being ready to hear cases will cause many controversies to be settled out of court.

It is gratifying to us to know that the United States led the world in organized work for peace. We established three Peace Societies in 1815, the first in the world. The International Peace Congresses had their inception in Boston. Since 1900 sixty-three cases of dispute between nations have been settled by arbitration. America had the honor of opening the Hague Court. At the Pan-American Congress held in Mexico in 1901–2, all the Central and South American States asked for admission to the Hague Court. Ten of them went further and signed a treaty to settle their difficulties with each other by arbitration. Forty nations of the two hemispheres have now no cause of war with each other. This is most encouraging, but there is still a great deal to be accomplished.

It is quite unnecessary to attempt to portray the horrors, the cruelties, the barbarities of war, its degrading and demoralizing influences upon society. The sufferings upon the battlefield are equaled only by the anguish and desolations of families at home. The enormous expenditure of money to maintain armies and navies in time of peace is a fearful drain upon the resources of the people, consuming the vitals of nations, a heavy tax upon all industry and commerce. This waste of the people's money has become a serious menace to progress and prosperity.

Therefore it is that financial and business institutions are demanding the gradual disarmament of nations and the destruction of the war system. It is hardly in the power of the imagination to conceive the beneficent results that would flow from the death of the monster that is gnawing the root of all prosperity, the curse of the world at the present time as it has been through all the ages.

Only last January I had the honor of inviting Mr. Thomas Barclay to deliver an address before the Boston Chamber of Commerce. He clearly pointed out to us our duty and responsibility as a body of business men. He informed us how he had succeeded in obtaining the influence of the commercial bodies of Great Britain and France, several hundred in number, and through that influence the governments of the two nations had been led to execute a treaty of arbitration. It is in the power of the business men to put a stop to war by refusing to furnish the money, the sinews of war. Nations must borrow the money, must float their bonds, and they cannot do this without the support of financiers, of those who control the money markets of the world.

As a result of the address of Mr. Barclay a Committee of the Chamber of Commerce was formed, and this led to an International Arbitration Committee of Massachusetts. Similar action has followed in other States. The movement is spreading, and soon, very soon, a large majority of the Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce of the country will be united in the demand for arbitration treaties between this country and the mother country and other nations of Europe.

Boston has been called the city of "isms," and so it has been in a certain way from Puritanism to the present day, and it is this that has given it place and power. But if by the term "ism" is meant fanaticism and foolish sentimentalism, I repel the charge. It is a city of patriotism, of high and noble idealism. It stands for what is true and right and just, and therefore it is that this peace movement had its origin here in this city. [Applause.]

The merchants of Boston have a record of which we may well be proud, — distinguished at home and throughout the world for integrity, for sagacity, for honorable dealing, for energy and enterprise. Boston has occupied a high position in regard to its commerce with the world. It is the mission of commerce to cultivate friendly relations with all nations. Its swift-winged messengers traverse the ocean laden with the products of one clime and one people to be exchanged for those of other climes and peoples, and bearing aloft the ensign of nationality in fraternal greeting. It promotes the comfort, the welfare, the happiness of mankind. It has suffered much in time of war, it has been plundered and destroyed, and yet its course has ever been onward and upward, ameliorating the condition of mankind.

All business interests are affected by even the mere apprehension of war. It is not long since we had occasion to experience such a result, and hundreds of millions of dollars were lost by the financial panic and revulsion in business, so sensitive are the money markets and the business interests to anything relating to war. Therefore it behooves the business interests of this country to take action with the business organizations of other nations, and to call upon the respective governments to negotiate treaties of arbitration and to proceed to a gradual disarmament. [Applause.]

I now have the pleasure of presenting to you a gentleman who has occupied a high position in his own country, and who has rendered efficient service in this great cause, the Hon. John Lund, member of the Norwegian Parliament. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN LUND.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: With several of my colleagues I am asked this evening to consider the significance of peace as related to the interests of commerce. This is so apparent that no exhaustive array of proofs should be needful. For undisturbed trade routes and means of communication under our modern system are as essential to the health of nations as an uninterrupted blood circulation is to the individual. An instant's disturbance may cause a loss to the people of a country of millions of money, just as surely as any serious irregularity in the organism of the man may produce illness or death.

If it is true that the world of trade looked on skeptically for a brief period at our peace efforts, the veil has now fallen from its eyes. It is now out and out friendly to our movement. Often there are no more active or insistent abettors than business men in the matter of effecting treaties and guarantees for the protection of the course of trade and business.

During the course of my parliamentary work in my homeland, as a business man the development of systems of intercommunication was my especial study. Therefore it was of very special interest to me to observe your enormous achievements in that line during my recent journey as a member of the Interparliamentary Union. We were made guests of your government during three weeks; we traversed some thousands of miles through half a score of states and scores of towns, crossing rivers and skirting lakes, to your picturesque Rocky Mountain region, even making an ascent of ten thousand feet — everywhere carried by the magic powers of steam and electricity. Whilst I was almost dumb with admiration at the extent and beauty of the achievements of your American spirit and energy, I felt it would be the most heinous sin if war were to be permitted to lay its ravaging hand upon the material happiness and well-being which I witnessed.

Let us now turn to a closer view of the actual conditions war creates, and learn what figures teach us concerning the material ills involved. The great economic damages which war occasions are not quite so manifest, they are not so easily grasped as the number of deaths and maimings. But all the same they are terrible enough. We must remember that every wasted shilling is a deduction from the economic basis on which a community should rest; it is stolen here or there, even if it is never officially imposed in the shape of taxes.

Preparations for and rumors of war contribute their share to cause disturbances in the ordinary, everyday financial relations. The land which will carry on a war must be prepared to see its stocks sink in value, and this often affects millions of those who have invested their hard won savings in the stocks. It is enough to point to the state of affairs which prevailed on the Bourses in most of the great European capitals at the outbreak of the war between Russia and Japan. The very day the declaration of war was announced the value of the Russian Loan Stocks fell in France by about half a milliard of francs.

If we look at the sums which go to the carrying on of a war, and the expenses which accompany it, we shall find still more enormous amounts which have literally gone up in smoke. There have been computations of what the most important of the wars in the last half of the nineteenth century have cost. The list is something like this: Crimean War, £340,000,000; war in Italy, £60,000,000; the Austro-Prussian War, £66,000,000; the Franco-German War, £500,000,000; the Russo-Turkish War, £200,000,000; Britain's war against the Zulus and Afghans, £30,000,000. To this we may add that Britain's war with the Boers in South Africa has cost the British tax-payers alone no less a sum than £230,000,000.

Hanotaux has reckoned that the total loss of money by France alone in the last war with Germany amounted to about fifteen milliards of francs (£600,000,000).

And what sums the present war is swallowing daily? *Le Matin* has calculated that the fleets of Russia and Japan have cost about £539,000,000. How much of these many millions will have been destroyed when the war is at an end? The Japanese *Financial Gazette* informs us that in the war with China every soldier cost Japan 16 shillings per day. Now, if Japan, as is estimated, places 300,000 men in the field against Russia, this army, according to the same calculation, will cost Japan daily £240,000, or about £7,200,000 per month.

At the peace following the last Russo-Turkish war, Turkey had to hand over to Russia £45,000,000, besides a large extent of country (originally Russia demanded a hundred millions more). France had to pay Germany five milliards of francs (£200,000,000) and cede Alsace and Lorraine. Austria had to give Prussia in 1866 the sum of £3,000,000 (originally double the amount was claimed). After the last war with Greece, Turkey received £4,000,000. And the British Parliament, after the war in South Africa, granted £4,500,000 "in connection with the conclusion of peace."

Europe has had peace for about a generation; nevertheless the expenditure for military affairs, in all the European countries, has in that period increased to a perfectly incredible extent. This is due to the system which is known as the "armed peace." The system consists in this, that the great powers arm themselves incessantly more and more in order to prevent war from breaking out between them. Each one of them at present wishes peace, but each fears that the others will break it. Consequently, they all annually squander enormous sums to keep themselves armed. They want to terrify the others into keeping the peace, and at the same time they keep themselves prepared for all eventualities.

However absurd this procedure may be, yet it would, in its result, be satisfactory enough, if, on the one hand, it offered reasonable guarantees against war, and, on the other hand, was not so tremendously costly. But even these almost intolerable armaments do not give the great powers any absolute security. So far as the small powers are concerned, they are forced to arm themselves just as much beyond their resources as the great, and yet their straining does not offer them nearly so much security as theirs offers the great. If a great power wishes to appropriate the territory of a small country, either wholly or in part, or in any way to extort advantages from such a country, it can often secure its end quite readily without disturbing the peace between the great powers. And the costs are such that a further progress in the same direction can hardly have other issue than the ruin both of the small and the great.

The total state expenditure on the European armies in 1903 amounted to £260,000,000. To this, amongst many other things, must be added the value of the working power which goes to waste by so many as four million young men being always occupied in war exercises instead of engaged in something productive. The value of this working power has been calculated at £220,000,000. Thus

Europe's calculable annual expenditure for the maintenance of the "armed peace" amounts to £480,000,000. This amounts to £1 1s. 8d. per head. If we took into consideration the interest and instalments of the national debt, which, so far as the great powers are concerned, has essentially been caused by and for war and armaments, we should reach more than £1 10s. per individual. The united revenue of the European nations amounted in all in 1903 to about £1,190,000,000, more than one-fifth whereof went for war preparations in time of peace.

The expenses of Great Britain for army and navy in 1903 amounted to about £66,000,000.

The British war budget has risen in the eight years from 1895 to 1903 by fifty per cent. for the army and one hundred per cent. for the navy; and the average of the war budget for every individual in Great Britain amounts to £2 10s. sterling.

Russia in time of peace keeps in Europe and Asia over one million soldiers under arms, at an annual cost of more than £55,000,000.

History testifies that no great idea has won its way to victory except through severe struggles. Nor will it be otherwise in this campaign, where it is necessary to fight an evil which has the prescriptive right and the repute of thousands of years to support it. Whether the ideal, perpetual peace, can ever be attained, it would be idle at present to attempt to discuss. We must be satisfied if we see the cause gradually securing a readier entrance into the general consciousness, and if we can point to satisfactory results here and there. If by the instrumentality of negotiation and arbitration the horrors of only a single war can be prevented, much will be gained.

American men of business surely know how to make money. Let us hope that the still greater art of making peace is within the scope of their knowledge; that they may understand that millions devoted to the service of peace will be of greater importance to themselves, to humanity in general, than the millions which year after year are given for warships and the modern murderous inventions. I hope that the United States will in this, as in many other respects, make a record above that of the Old World. Her reward will be in the welfare and blessing of millions of mankind, and in gratitude from the Old as from the New World.

The Chairman next introduced Edward Atkinson, the distinguished economist and statistician of Boston.

ADDRESS OF EDWARD ATKINSON.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have not come here to make a speech or to appeal to your sentiments; I have merely a practical suggestion of a plain business man to submit to you.

The interdependence of nations is becoming the rule, isolation is gone; and this interdependence makes for peace and plenty.

Commerce and civilization have been in past centuries developed by war, and even in war men have arisen who have also been great statesmen. But that class of military men deplored the warfare which had been necessary in defense of liberty.

When all nations and states were predatory, as they were far into the nineteenth century, when they endeavored to expand commerce by conquest and by establishing colonies under armed force for the selfish benefit and profit of the conquerors, wars in defense of liberty were necessary.

Having regard mainly to the present conditions of the English speaking people, but also to the conditions of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain and Italy, the predatory system of conquest and colonization has about ended. It has imposed excessive cost upon nations without adequate return, and it has not proved to be profitable until after the right of local self-government has been granted to the colonies. Even in Germany, with the growth of intelligence among the masses, a stern resistance is rapidly being developed against the military class which they have not yet been able to overcome and suppress. When their power has been but little more asserted, as it soon will be when the privates in the ranks become fully imbued with the wrongs under which they suffer, the predatory instincts of the military caste will be overcome and the privileged classes will be suppressed.

Commerce is becoming the paramount power in the civilized world, and in the present century we shall surely witness the suppression of militarism. Witness the fact that by the united action of the Chambers of Commerce of Great Britain, France and Italy, the governments of these countries have been, if one may use the expression, willingly compelled to enact treaties of arbitration by which a very large part of the previous causes of war will be removed to the courts for a judicial decision.

There is one other great movement by which the peace of the world may be almost assured, which it is now time for the forces of commerce to take up and carry to its completion. It may at first seem visionary, but it is in fact simple, practical and sure of being sustained by all the states and nations that have recently entered into treaties of arbitration.

In the last century it became necessary or expedient to establish neutral zones on land and water: Belgium and Switzerland were neutralized; the Suez Canal has been and the Panama Canal will be neutralized. But the most conspicuous example of practical neutralization is found upon our own continent and on our own borders. In the last war between Great Britain and the United States, the War of 1812, two of the contests of the most vital importance were between the small navies of the Great Lakes that separate the United States from the Dominion of Canada. In these contests the Americans were successful; the British vessels were nearly all destroyed, and the American vessels, most of which had been hastily improvised, were badly shattered. In order to meet the future dangers, the United States laid down the keels of a new navy and began to construct it. England was preparing to follow. In 1816 John Quincy Adams was appointed United States Minister to the Court of St. James. He proposed to the Foreign Office that neither nation should build or maintain vessels of war upon these Great Lakes. Presently he returned to become Secretary of War under President Monroe. He then entered into a simple agreement, not even making a formal treaty with the British Foreign Office, on the lines which he had suggested. The President submitted this agreement to the Senate for approval, providing that there should be no naval force or armed vessels on the Great Lakes, recommending it in these words, "in order to avoid collision and save expense." And now since 1817 the only vessel of war that has appeared upon those lakes was a model of the warship "Massachusetts," built of brick and furnished with wooden guns, at the Chicago Exposition [laughter], the least costly and the most useful ship of war that we ever had in our service. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, the greatest waterways of commerce are not upon the lakes; they are upon the Atlantic Ocean. The ferry ways are well defined, marked on all the charts; winter and summer routes are laid down from all our ports to the harbors of Western Europe. Why not, "in order to avoid collision and to save expense," neutralize these ferry ways? Why not enter upon treaties among the states that border upon the seas, defining neutral zones and uniting navies in the useful purpose of protecting the commerce and maintaining the neutrality of those zones? [Applause.] Is that visionary? Not half as visionary as it would have been a few years ago to have proposed the treaties of arbitration now existing. It needs only the common sense and sagacity and force of the business men of the different countries to compel the neutrality of the ferry ways on the high seas, where the Peace of God shall be kept [applause], by force if necessary.

Lay out, if you please, a cock-pit outside the neutral zone, and let those who make the wars and who think that warfare develops manhood man their steel-clad coffins and meet in the cock-pit and sink each other's battleships — except one, to be put away as a monument to the skilled inventor, who is perhaps doing more to make war impossible than even we, the advocates of peace.

These ways of commerce may be made. There is nothing lacking but the will. It is time for the men of business to assert the power, to demand in the name of common sense, common sagacity, common industry, common right and common wealth, that the curse of war shall cease. And then will come the day so eloquently pictured by Gladstone, when the ships that pass between this land and that shall be like the shuttle of the loom, weaving the web of concord among the nations. [Applause.]

The Chairman: I will now call upon Mr. Georg Arnhold, a member of the leading banking house in Dresden and President of the Dresden Peace Society.

REMARKS OF MR. GEORG ARNHOLD.

Mr. Georg Arnhold spoke in German, and Dr. Urban interpreted his remarks:

Mr. Arnhold is surprised at the immense progress of the peace movement in America when compared with that in Germany. Of course, in Germany one realizes that war is a dreadful thing, but owing to political and economical conditions the success of the peace movement has been rather slow there.

He calls particular attention to the fact that the German Emperor is a friend of peace, though of course of the "armed peace." He quotes some words of the Emperor protesting against being taken for a soldier, especially for a soldier who seeks bloody laurels. Only for the sake of peace he increases every year his army and navy.

In spite of these circumstances the peace movement in Germany has been progressive, and now the German Peace Society has about twelve thousand members, though it is very young. [Applause.] As in every movement in Germany, the members of the universities have been the leaders, but the business men and the working men have also done their share. In this he finds a favorable sign for the peace movement, and he hopes that economical and financial considerations will reach the other people, the manufacturers and the owners of the large farms, and will convince them that they are lost if they continue to oppose the peace movement. [Applause.]

The Chairman: We shall now have the pleasure of listening to Mr. George Foster Peabody of New York City.

ADDRESS OF MR. GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The cause for which we are gathered here, it seems to me, represents an active principle. The peace which we believe in is something that depends upon our recognition of that in man and woman which is to be reverenced. We believe that people should think more of themselves than to try to force upon others that which they would object to have forced upon them. It seems to me that we shall not make the progress in this cause that we believe ought to be made unless we consider it from that standpoint. Not that the peace men are those who want to avoid something that seems difficult and expensive, but that we have convictions as to the rights of other men as well as of ourselves.

Modern business methods develop just that principle in active progress. Even among the speculative interests, so called, and particularly in business, there has been developed to a very large extent the principle of arbitration, in order that loss and friction may be avoided. In fact, the whole course of modern business has been along the line of trying to economize expense and waste in every direction, and no single development in the way of economy has been greater in its results than this particular one of the arbitration of difficulties between men engaged in business. They have come to respect each other's rights.

Of course, the great fundamental business interests of the country are apart from the speculative. They depend upon a condition which enables the largest number of men to produce the largest quantity; which enables the transportation of that production with the least expense; which enables the development of machinery to work with the least friction. So in every direction the business principle has been to avoid friction and waste, and wear and tear, and thus to show consideration for the rights of others.

Now the American business men are only representative, after all, in our democracy, of the great multitude of our people, because all the business man does is to make the transfers economically from the producer to the consumer, and we are all consumers.

We must, of course, we business men, who are only just now interesting ourselves in the subject, give due credit to the men and women who have for generations in this country, and for a somewhat shorter period on the European continent, been putting their minds to the question of bringing about the prevention of friction between the nations. They have been splendidly pushing forward the cause which we now have so much at heart, the substitution of arbitration for war.

It is important that those of us who believe in peace should take time to consider just what it is we believe in. There has been too much of half-heartedness in much that has been uttered. Men have said that they are peace men, but that wars must sometimes be. I do not believe that we should applaud the men who come and say, "Yes, we must have peace," and then at other times are trying to build up armies and navies; men who praise peace, but who day in and day out do not work for the development of it as an active principle, who have not grasped the principle of the respect that we should have for other men and women. If we follow this principle of mutual respect we are bound to try to prevent friction and waste between nations, just as business men have been learning to do in their mutual relations.

The Chairman: Mr. Peabody has recalled to my mind a fact which had escaped my notice. It is a by-law of the leading Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade in this country that one member shall not sue another at law; he is obliged by the by-laws of the Association to submit any difference that may occur in the prosecution of business to a committee of arbitration. [Applause.] And therefore you can readily see how desirous members of these business organizations are that the same principle shall apply to international difficulties and controversies that they apply themselves every day in their own business. [Applause.]

The manufacturing interests of this country are of very great importance, employing billions of capital, and we are most fortunate in having these interests represented at this meeting. Mr. A. B. Farquhar, Vice-President of the National Association of Manufacturers, will now address you.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS AND INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

ADDRESS OF A. B. FARQUHAR.

The National Association of Manufacturers of the United States received, last fall, an invitation to be represented at an Arbitration Conference to be held in Washington the following January. By a vote of the Executive Committee, the invitation was accepted, and thus is that important body of practical men, believed to be at this time the greatest business organization in the world, committed to your cause. Having enjoyed the very high honor of representing the Association at the January Conference, I am naturally very desirous of enlisting the manufacturing interest in your movement. To every citizen of the Union it is important to achieve the successful substitution of pacific methods and international law for warfare and preparations for war, but to manufacturers it is particularly so. Some of them can make a comfortable profit from government war contracts, doubtless, and a few others can gain more from increased prices of goods sold than is lost on materials bought; but as a rule their prosperity or adversity is a reflexion of the prosperity or adversity of their customers,—the great public,—and they suffer by any cause that makes their fellow-citizens less capable of spending. Where much is wasted, many may find a chance to realize something, yet the rule is that waste makes want, and that want cuts down demand. People buy when taxes are low and risks are small; they try to save all they can when pinched by the exactions of war expenditures, and when life and property are imperiled. Let those who will, then, deride the move to replace hostilities by peaceful settlement of misunderstandings as impracticable; the thoughtful man of business knows that nothing is more truly practical.

The opposition relies on sneers, not arguments; no one dares to come out openly against arbitration, and thus be "overcome" and disarmed in fair encounter, but, like the famous lawyer whose rule when he had "no case" was to "abuse the plaintiff's attorney," our antagonists pay more attention to us than to our cause. Who is there, whose opinion is worth noticing, who fails to acknowledge the superiority of arbitration to arms? It is safe to say, none; and yet there are many who will do nothing to establish the better method because they profess to fear that somebody else is going to refuse to follow it. This is the spirit of the priests of the Middle Ages, who never shed blood themselves, but, when they had a victim to dispose of, simply withdrew from him the protection of the Church and "turned him over to the secular arm"; or of the strike leaders, who claim that deeds of violence against non-unionists are not done by strikers themselves, but by some conveniently unnamable "sympathizers." I do not regard this spirit as practical. The practical advice to every nation and every citizen is that coming to him in the words of the prophet of old: "Thou art the man!" If there is a call to any people on earth to work for the prevalence of universal arbitration, that call is to us as Americans, to us as individuals.

We are often reminded of the conspicuous part already played by this country in international arbitrations, as if that furnished a reason for resting on our oars, and letting others do the pulling hereafter. I rejoice in everything in this line that my country has done, and honor her for having seen her duty so clearly. This is the very land that the initiative ought to have come from; and it is also the very land best fitted to stand in the vanguard of the movement hereafter. Who could better lead than a people whose power is recognized as matchless, whose resources are inexhaustible, whose readiness and alertness are an unfailing defense, making them completely secure against aggression from without, so long as union and concord continue within? What other nation can point, as we, to the magnificently successful operation of a tribunal in her own territory, which has for more than a century done work of the precise kind demanded of an international arbitration tribunal, — as proof that an equal success is possible in the adjudication of cases under the law of nations?

There is much more that we can do for the triumph of our cause than merely to say we approve it. What we can do is to act as if we believed in it, as if we trusted it. Arbitration will never become the universally accepted solution of international questions, while the nations are showing by their daily conduct that they are really looking beyond it to something else as the final resort. The inseparable accompaniment of arbitration is disarmament. Huge standing armies, frowning fortifications, mammoth war-vessels, all the apparatus, so costly and at the same time so useless for any but destructive purposes, — it is these that a genuine trust in a reasonable settlement of the nations' differences would speedily render obsolete. And that is a move in which our own country could fittingly lead. Unrivaled in resources, we are at the same time most remote from imaginable aggressors, most inaccessible to possible attack. No foreign power could reach our shores in any strength, unless after long delay, nor make a hostile landing with reasonable expectation of escaping in safety. Preparations for warfare are therefore particularly absurd, with us — would be so even if they were effective when made. But our forts, on which there was such confident reliance a generation ago, are now unanimously voted no defense at all against modern heavy artillery, while vessels of war are notoriously short-lived. From a business point of view, a worse investment than a modern war-vessel would be hard to find. After what the events of the last few months have shown of the ease with which they can be snuffed out, little value can be found for them in any way. To a nation distinguished for practical common sense, the absurdity of throwing away millions on such clumsy toys should not need to be proved.

But the worst of these war preparations is not their cost, though $200,000,000 a year, by a country needing no such defense, is no small sum to squander; nor even the worthlessness of the product when procured: it is the evidence they give that our protestations of peaceful disposition are not to be taken at face value. Many weaker nations share our continent with us, and how can we prevent them from asking: What mean these forts and men-of-war, for which the United States is spending so much money? It is absurd to suppose that all this preparation is for defense. For what purpose can it be, then, but to aid or cover aggressive warfare, to oppress or intimidate us? To most of our citizens — it might almost be said to all — the use of force to oppress or intimidate other American nations would be utterly repulsive; but we cannot be surprised to find other countries less incapable of misunderstanding our intention, particularly when we give them what they cannot but regard as ground for suspicion. By cutting down navy, army and fortification expenses the country could better develop its resources and discharge its debts, and at the same time give evidence of its peaceful intentions toward all the world, while proving that it does not merely favor international arbitration, but trusts to it.

But I am going perhaps too far. However convinced I may be that our plan involves national disarmament as its logical accompaniment, I do not forget that the Washington Arbitration Conference, last January, confined itself to asking for treaties under which cases of disagreement should be referred normally, promptly and smoothly to the Hague Tribunal. This was very little to ask; that little is altogether in accordance with the course of our country in being represented at the Hague Conference, and in contributing as we did to the conclusions of that Conference; and we should not cease from our efforts until this modest demand is granted. One step taken, our further progress will naturally be determined by its result.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now ask your attention to the last speaker on the program, Mr. Frederick H. Jackson, President of the Providence Chamber of Commerce.

REMARKS OF MR. FREDERICK H. JACKSON.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: What I have to say will take but a few moments, and I shall not weary your patience, I trust.

Different eras have been marked by varying predominating characteristics and tendencies. We speak of the age of chivalry, poetry, art or invention, because they were periods when one or the other of these influences was paramount and made great strides toward better and fuller interpretation.

Ours is the age of practicalities. One need only look upon this audience and consider the specific object of this meeting, the auspices under which it is being held, to fully realize that we have arrived at an intensely practical era in the experience of mankind. Here we have commercial organizations taking part in the deliberations of an international peace congress; greed striking hands with charity; sordidness embracing meekness. If the affiliation seem incongruous it is because we have failed heretofore in our comprehension of true relations, for nothing could be more natural than the union of men of peace with the men of trade. All branches of business should be, and are, interested in peace and arbitration,— manufacturing, agriculture, commerce, banking and all financial institutions. All of these interests require for their stability, growth and perpetuity the assurance of peace among the nations, not only for the sake of the domestic welfare of each, but also for the proper and possible development of trade relations with the whole world, and safe and untrammeled transit over the highways of the ocean.

The world has been accustomed to give hardly passing attention to those who have preached the doctrine of peace; the doctrine announced by the Master of us all, the Prince of Peace, whose advent was heralded by the angels over the far Judean hills more than nineteen hundred years ago, with their song of "Peace on earth, goodwill to men." From then till now, through all the centuries, wars and tumults, hatred and strife, have reigned not only among nations and peoples who gave Him no allegiance, but among His followers as well, who, in their greed and mad thirst for blood, have committed untold crimes and horrors.

Now, after nineteen centuries, when we are apt to think that materialism is enthroned, that the ethical side of man's nature is being overwhelmed with practicalities, we are brought face to face with the fact that at no time in the world's history has been so imminent the consummation of the angelic proclamation.

Those of us who were permitted to be present at the Conference at Lake Mohonk last June will long remember the spirit of it, that it was full of inspiration and promise, promise of a bright and glorious day when the directors of finance, manufactures and commerce shall vie with the philanthropist, the academician and the statesman in their efforts to accomplish the ends for which this Congress has been convened, namely, the amelioration of the horrors of war and the utilization of heretofore misdirected forces to uplift mankind.

You are familiar with the statistics educed to show the tremendous drain upon the resources of a nation plunged in war. The mechanic and the laborer are the first to suffer, both on account of the increased cost of the necessities of life and also because of the reduction in wages or curtailment in the hours of work, arising from the disturbed financial conditions which war always produces. Apprehension and stagnation bring indirect suffering to the artisan, the farmer and all who depend upon the work of their hands for their daily bread. These are trite statements. Why, then, has the business world been so slow to recognize in the advocates of arbitration their best friends and allies? God be praised, our eyes are being opened; we realize that we have been blind, we rejoice in the miracle that has opened our eyes. Now that we see the way, let us walk in it!

The theorist and the dreamer have looked forward to the day when peace shall reign in the earth. They have proclaimed their doctrine to uninterested hearers. Not so to-day! Practical, hard-headed business men are awakening to the fact that war paralyzes industry and trade, frightens capital and stops the natural course of commerce. So it comes about that Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce pass resolutions endorsing the actions of peace and arbitration councils; then later on they appoint delegates to attend your conferences merely as a matter of form, but now and here we find ourselves representing those bodies in this notable assemblage, coöperating with you and adding our voices in a plea for arbitration among the nations, for reciprocity and every form of international agreement that shall hasten the day when the brotherhood of man shall not be a far-off vision, but a consummated fact.

The meeting then adjourned.

Public Meeting of Women in Park Street Church.

Wednesday Evening, October 5, 1904.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF WOMEN TOWARD THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

The meeting was called to order at 8 o'clock by LUCIA AMES MEAD, who said:

It is with great regret that I am compelled to tell you to-night that the lady whom we were to have as the presiding officer, the President of the International Council of Women, Mrs. May Wright Sewall, has telegraphed us that she is unable to be here, as she had hoped to be. She has sent us a letter, which, if I have opportunity, I will read to you later in the evening.

We do not want, in the speaking this evening, generalities, abstractions, but something definite. We want the world to know that women are not sentimentalists, that we possess workers, and have a definite program; that we know what we want, and are working definitely towards it. I hope, when we go from these meetings, that we shall feel pleased with the greatest Peace Congress ever held, and feel that each one of us has a part in the work; that we shall go out as disciples for peace; that we shall not only hate war and love peace, but that we shall be able to tell the people what definite steps ought to be taken towards peace.

Without further words, I am going to present to you one of my English friends, a lady whom I met in England during that terrible Boer War. One night my husband and I tried to get into a meeting in Queen's Hall. We found a great angry crowd around us and we heard some disagreeable things said. Mrs. Byles was inside that meeting. I think she did not get home until 1 o'clock in the morning. That is the way people in England who opposed the war were treated. Mrs. Byles has had a great experience. I am proud to call her my friend and to present her to you.

ADDRESS OF MRS. W. P. BYLES.

Mrs. Mead and Ladies and Gentlemen: What a wonderful inspiration to stand face to face with such a meeting as this.

The meeting to which Mrs. Mead has alluded just now was the most electric, the most passionate peace meeting that I have ever seen in a long experience with peace meetings. The truth must be told that that terrible war in the Transvaal, with all its mischief and its irreparable wrongs, has been the very making of the peace party in England. We had rough times, but I look back upon it with considerable satisfaction, because it pulled us all together. It pointed out the people who talked peace because it happened to be fashionable now and then; but it also showed us that we had thousands and thousands of women and men absolutely devoted to this great cause and knowing the reason for the faith that was in them.

To come here to Boston to this magnificent Congress is a fresh encouragement. Here, it is true, we are not altogether out of reach of the shadow of that terrible war which is going on in the Far East; and that, too, stimulates our imaginations, touches our consciences and quickens our intellects. We have to find a way out of this barbarous national life and sentiments which have been dominating the world so long as there have been human beings on it.

In this vital work I am one of those who deplore any separation of the interests of men and women. The interests of men and women in this matter, as in all matters affecting human society, are identical, and it is a very great danger, often, to liberty to separate them. I know very well that that separation here in Boston to-night is simply for the moment, in order that in the three large meetings which are being held the great principles for which we stand may be presented to a larger number of people. The success of our cause, the solutions of the problems which beset us, can only arise out of the upbuilding of a new type of national character, and in the upbuilding of that character it is necessary to have women at work as well as men. In the formation of that character, soldiers, battleships, guns, swords, can play no part.

What we want among the nations and what we want among individuals is what the theologians aptly call "a change of heart." If you look through history carefully, you will find that men and nations alike have been shaped in contact with character. We have to create a land where violence shall never more be heard, where the vile principles shall no more be called noble, where the worker of mischief shall be no longer worthy.

Dr. Johnson said that patriotism was the last refuge of the scoundrel. And truly much of the patriotism that has formed men's habits of late years has been of that description. It is the duty of all peace reformers to try to generate, by word and act and vote, a new patriotism; and the duty especially lies heavily upon us women to nourish a nobler patriotism, the patriotism of a noble life. War is, in the world of life, the law of death. Not only in national matters, but in private matters, is it the law of death. In industrial life and progress it is likewise the law of death. There is a nobler law than that — the law of mutual aim, the law of mutual coöperation.

Charles Darwin's doctrine, the fierce struggle for the survival of the fittest, has been dwelt upon until his teaching has become absolutely lopsided in the minds of many people. He did not omit to point out most carefully that those understand virtue best which contain the largest number of sympathetic parts. That is true, in a sense, not only of human life, but also of animal life and insect life, and even of plant life. It is sympathy and mutual aid and coöperation which will make this world go round, and go round to a very different tune to what it has gone round for thousands and tens of thousands of years.

There are several speakers to-night, and I must not make a long speech. I wish to say how glad we are to be in America, in this great new world. What wonderful experiences my husband and I have had since we set foot upon your shores five weeks ago! What a subject for thanksgiving it has been that we have seen no soldiers, not one, I think, since we came! Do not increase the number, my friends. You have got quite enough.

We were down to Kansas in our long and magnificent pilgrimage with the Interparliamentary delegation, and there we were shown, not the review of men hired to kill their neighbors, but the wonderful drill of men skilled in saving the lives of their neighbors. They took us to see the most wonderful things in Kansas — among them their firemen's drill. I don't believe there is another country in the world that would have selected that method of expression of their national, their social and their industrial life.

The only army that civilization acknowledges, as Victor Hugo so nobly tells us, is the army of schoolmasters, and with that army you are better equipped on this side of the ocean than any other country in the world except one, and that is one of the smallest organized states. I mean Switzerland. But that is a matter of just pride and satisfaction, and may your compulsory system of education and the enrichment of the heart and mind of your young people — may that grow, through which you are making the most wonderful thing the world has ever seen, this new nation of yours. May it be established in wisdom and truth and in peace. May you do your part — I am afraid that you will have to do more than your part in order to make up for those that do not do enough — to realize the dream of Victor Hugo that in the twentieth century war will be dead. May that dream be realized. Then we shall also realize the dream of Wordsworth, that "by the soul only are nations great and free."

THE CHAIRMAN: We all know what Miss Jane Addams of Chicago, who is now to speak to us, has done for industrial peace. Most of us have perhaps not realized what a world-wide interest is hers, and that she of all women has followed the saying, "My country is the world; my countrymen, all mankind." Miss Addams has written a book entitled "The Ideals of Peace," which the Macmillans are soon to publish. I am sure that all who hear her words to-night will be anxious to read that book. She is one of the women who needs no introduction to an American audience.

ADDRESS OF MISS JANE ADDAMS.

Mrs. Mead, Ladies and Gentlemen: Peace, during the last century, has had friends and promoters in three distinct lines. The first line, as it ought to have been, was the line of the preachers, which, of course, was best represented by your own Channing. They preached peace as a dogma, as a creed. They made an appeal to the sense of righteousness, which we all have somewhere within us, and they urged people to refrain from war and to follow the paths of peace. It was a noble dogma, but, as we know, dogma, as such, belongs more to the last two centuries than it does to this twentieth century. It belongs with the doctrinaire and the scholar.

Then another set of promoters of peace may be best represented by two great Russians. They were the persons who appealed to the sense of pity. Tolstoy in his work entitled "Peace and War" takes us through a long campaign, not with the officers who pore over maps, but with the common soldier, with poor old Pierre, who does not know what it is all about, who is hustled from one camp to another, who tries to fight when other people fight, who, when he is hit, feels very much grieved and is sure that the French do not know who he is or they would not try to kill him. The other great Russian, who has made this appeal to pity, has put before us war with all its wretchedness, with all its disease, with all its squalor. These perhaps more than any other two men have stripped war of its glamour.

Then come the third line of promoters, and, curiously enough, they are best represented, again, by a Russian subject. These promoters appeal to the sense of prudence; they say that property is a valuable thing, that it represents human bone and muscle. Mr. John de Bloch has written almost a library on this subject. Mrs. Mead has done much to make this point clear to the American mind when she tells us that one warship costs more than the entire grounds and buildings of Harvard University.

We now come to a new point, and we ask ourselves if there is not something more in accord with our present line of thinking, which may be said of this cause of peace, something a little more active and practical, less theoretical and sentimental than some of the old preachings of peace necessarily had to be.

I am very fond of Tolstoy, but I always wince when I hear people call him a non-resistant. The word is too feeble. Tolstoy yearns to see a great display of moral energy in the resistance of evil. It is only brute force which he discards. If your own Professor James were expressing it, he would say that Tolstoy is trying to create new springs of energy, because he tells us that through the paths of righteousness are called forth the very best powers of mankind.

Let us say that some great country,— only a few years ago we could not have illustrated it from America, and perhaps it is better now not to illustrate it from America, — let us say that the British have gone into a new country, into a virgin country, and that they wish to bring to it the blessings of civilization and self-government. What does the soldier do? He says, "We must establish law and order. We will do it by peaceful means first, but if we cannot do it that way, we will do it at the point of the bayonet." In the process of establishing law and order he may crush out the very beginnings of self-government. He may kill the most precious germs of some new exotic contribution to the science of human government which this simple people were making. If he were a believer in the creative energy of mankind, if he understood that all progress must come from the native soil, he would say, "I will watch this thing; I will nourish it; I will be careful not to impose upon it old and possibly worn out ideas." He would try to bring it new riches of human interest, new powers of human development. He would have to develop the most wonderful thing in the world, a new combination of people coming together in the line of self-government.

It seems to me that the power of soldiery is impotent if it employs the old-fashioned instruments that have been used for thousands of years. It is easy to kill a man. It is not easy to bring him forward in the paths of civilization. It is easy to have one broad road such as the British have laid out, and to say, "Some people are at this milestone, other people are at that milestone." But we know that civilization is no such thing; that it has no metes and bounds, but that it advances along devious paths. A man has not begun to read history aright, he does not know the very first rudiments of human life, if he imagines that we are all going to march down one narrow road. If we could only convert our men and women, and make them see that war is destructive, that peace is creative, that if a man commit himself to warfare he is committing himself to the played-out thing, and not to the new, vigorous and fine thing along the lines of the highest human development, we should have accomplished very much.

There is one moral pit into which we continually fall, a sort of hidden pit which the devil digs for the feet of the righteous. It is that we keep on in one way because we have begun that way, and do not have presence of mind enough to change when that path is no longer the right one. The traditional way, the historic way, is the way the Romans used when they went forward into Europe and levied taxes and then brought back to Rome all their treasure and all their finest blood. That is the easiest way.

But if we have the spirit of moral adventure, if we believe, as we pretend to believe in America, in democracy, then we shall be ready to take another course, even if it be much more difficult. I do not believe people can say that we no longer believe in democracy in America, but they can say that we no longer trust democracy. Almost every state in Europe has established forts in Africa or Asia or some other place. It seems to me that here in America is the place for experiment. Let us say, "We will trust the people although they are of a different color, although they are of a different tradition from ours. Perhaps we shall be able, through our very confidence, to nourish them into another type of government, not Anglo-Saxon even. Perhaps we shall be able to prove that some things that are not Anglo-Saxon are of great value, of great beauty. Let us not be like the men in commercial life, who say it is easy enough to go into a place after it has been swept clear by warships. You can force anything on natives when they have been once intimidated. But we must proceed in a different way. We must do our work on the highest plane. We have a higher ideal than the old one which has been incorporated in the rule of first gaining government control by force and making things safe. I can imagine that most young men would say that they will not go into these new regions until a warship has gone first. The man with courage would be the man who would prefer to go without the warships, just as a brave young man walks the streets of Chicago without arms, while the coward carries brass knuckles and a revolver in his hip pocket.

Let us see that this more dispassionate idea of self-government, this more modern idea of human life, begins with a few groups of people here and there. Let us declare that just as an individual shows signs of decay when he loses his power of self-mortification, his power of self-surrender, when he begins to be cautious, when he begins to say I cannot do this thing because it may injure my future, so it is with a nation. A nation ought to be able, in some way, to arrive at a proper conception of patriotism. The words "economic patriotism" will, I hope, in future years come to have a meaning to us. We cannot afford to be too careful of our nation's life any more than we can afford to be too careful of our individual life. We must not forget that there is something in the old idea that the world is a theatre for noble action, and that nation which yearns for noble action will be the nation of the future, as the self-forgetting young person is sure to come out ahead of the person who is cautious at an early age.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Addams has said a word about the cost of a battleship, but she has not told the whole story. When I first published the fact that the battleship "Oregon" cost as much as all the buildings of Harvard University, nearly all the Boston newspapers took the matter up and wanted to know where I got my figures. I got them from the Secretary of Harvard University and the Secretary of War. I found afterward that I had not properly stated the case. The cost of one first-class battleship, a battleship the maintenance of which requires hundreds of thousands of dollars each year, which lasts only thirteen years, and which, with the pressure of an electric button, is sent to the bottom of the sea — the cost of such a battleship is not only equal to that of the ninety buildings of Harvard University, but of the land as well, the valuation of all the lands and all the buildings, plus the valuation of all the lands and all the buildings of the Hampton Institute, plus the valuation of all the land and all the buildings of Tuskegee Institute.

Ruskin has told us that one of the most dangerous things in the world, in fooling people, is the misuse of words. There are a great many such misused words floating round in our churches, in our schools, over our teacups. One of these is the word "colonies" for "dependencies." People call the Philippines colonies. There are such things as colonies, but the Philippines are not. India is not a colony. Australia is a colony. A colony means a body of people sent out from the mother country to settle an empty country. We were colonies once. We were Englishmen and English women, and we came here across the sea into an empty country. When you go into a country already populated by an alien race and annex them, you have not a colony.

Our next speaker has come from a dependency. Miss Helen E. Dunhill has come to us from India, and is going to speak about the military life in that dependency.

ADDRESS OF MISS HELEN E. DUNHILL.

Madam Chairman and Dear Friends: India's salutation of peace to you! India's three hundred millions thank you for this opportunity. As I have had the privilege for many years of traveling all over that great land of Hindoostan, what do I see, what does a woman see? Scattered all over the land are the white soldiers — seventy thousand young Englishmen. What else does she see? Thirteen thousand fresh sons coming every year, while something less than thirteen thousand go back again. How long do they stay? Five years. What do they carry back with them? Ah, they carry back what the woman's eye reads written across military life in India. London's sons have perhaps hardly heard the words, "state regulation of vice," in their fair land, but India teaches them very much in five years. They go back to England's skies and say little of that seed sowed in their hearts which their mothers weep over, and they go back to reap a dreadful harvest in their poor bodies — you know the name of it.

I am not speaking on the art of the soldier. I am speaking of the women of India. What does this mean to her? You know that, too. You know the terror of the young girl — we have no young womanhood in India. There is a child and then there is a woman. You can understand the terror that comes into her heart when she understands what "state regulation of vice" means. I am not speaking of war. You have heard wise words about it. I am speaking of the military system and its affects on one-fifth of the world, three hundred million people. Two hundred and fifty million of them cannot read. There is no man so prominent in India as this white man, — the white man or the British soldier. That is the name he is known by.

Friends, how does this affect the men of India? Written on military life is another word, the "———". Besides this awful unnamable sin, drink has come in India, and largely through the military.

Fifty years ago one brewery disgraced India. Now there are twenty-four in a land where before there was almost total abstinence. But ah! the soldier has to have his drink. The government brews about six million gallons of common beer every year, and buys as much more from the people that work under it, for the British soldier. He buys some for himself, and the poor man of India, the man whose average income every day is two cents, — most of our peasantry get that, and no more, — comes to look up to this man of the dominant race. Somehow he gets into the inner life of India. The natives look up to him. They learn the habit of drink.

There is the cultured woman of India. She does not read, but she has refinement. She is shut in for a lifetime, perhaps widowed for many years. She has put away her baby, perhaps two babies, although the years of her life are only twelve. The dear little shrinking mother of India! How does she try to hide some of her sorrows! Now and then she peeps from her window. She may not go out upon the street. A red-coated white man passes. Friends, that may be the only white man she has ever seen, and he is staggering under the effects of drink. They give him only one hour of work. What can he do but idle about and drink and do what we think is worse than drink.

And now, we appeal to you. The burden of India calls for help. You have spoken of it as a dependency. Yes, Madam Chairman, some of the dolls you send out to India are intended for children. But we are all of us children in many senses. Do you know that there all those dolls are claimed by the grandmothers of India. They want to play with them. "Let me take it for five minutes at least." "Let me kiss that dolly." The heart of the woman, cultured as it is, educated in some cases, looks up somehow always to the dominant race.

A dear lady, to-day, whom I met in this Congress said, "I feel as though I were talking to my mother." I am Eurasian, — Indian and English. All of them look up somehow to any one who has a drop of white man's blood, and the British soldier represents the white man as no one else. The child appeals to you, not only the woman and the man. In India to-day, as a result of this military system, you can see a race called Eurasian, — little children running about in the villages whose dark mothers never hear again from the white military father of these little ones. He has gone back after his five years to his own land and taken to himself a lovely white wife, perhaps, but those are his children in India, and they are growing up. I do not labor myself under the disabilities of their birth and their sad environment. But I speak for that class, the result of having the unmarried soldiery in our midst, — a very small per cent. of them marry, five per cent., perhaps. This sad, sad condition is bringing no blessing to our three hundred millions.

And now, may I tell you why I have had the privilege of standing here, and of addressing you. In one of our many languages there is a word for Woman's Christian Temperance Union. As national organizer of this Union I came to the World's Convention last year, the white women's international convention in Switzerland. In connection with this convention we wrote letters in most every country on peace and arbitration. And when I go back home from the United States I will carry the cause of this Congress and beg them to write in our national characters the same letters that Mrs. Bailey is so earnestly stirring up hearts with in this land, and we will all serve in this temperance union under the Prince of Peace, "because He is over all and in all."

THE CHAIRMAN: Sixty years ago Joseph Sturge of England, the great philanthropist and anti-slavery reformer, came to Boston. He was a friend of Whittier, and of all the anti-slavery leaders. He was the man who, first of all in this world, suggested an international peace congress. He was in Boston in 1841, when he made the suggestion in a meeting of peace workers which was presided over by Amasa Walker. This evening we have on the platform his daughter, Miss Sophia Sturge of Birmingham, England. She has a little suggestion which she has embodied in a brief paper. She does not trust her voice to read it to you, but Dr. Darby has kindly consented to read it for her.

SUGGESTION OF MISS SOPHIA STURGE.

The editor of this Report regrets greatly that he has been unable to secure a copy of Miss Sturge's paper in time for insertion here. The chief point of the suggestion was that, as a part of the constructive peace work to be done, a Hall of Peace should be erected in every prominent city to be used by the people for meetings and for active work along peace lines.

The Chairman next introduced Dr. Yamei Kin of China.

REMARKS OF DR. YAMEI KIN.

Mrs. Mead and Friends: It is indeed a great privilege to me as a representative of one of the oldest of nations, which has always stood for the dominant idea of peace, to come to you, friends in America, in the pride of my race, because I am a pure Chinese without a drop of the would-be dominant race in my veins. I thank you, friends, for all the kindness that has been shown me and for all your friendly hands extended in the many courtesies that go to make life beautiful. I understand that on Friday I may have the opportunity of showing you why it is that we appreciate in you a spirit of peace, because, if you will pardon us, we of the old race that has lived long upon this earth and have tested and have read the human motives and human actions — we may be pardoned, perhaps, for suggesting to you a little of the better qualities that you will go on cultivating, laying aside at the same time some of the qualities that have come to you from your inheritance of the Western civilization. We of the East, the eldest of the East, the nation that has stood for peace from earliest times, look to you, the youngest nation, to join with the flower of the Occidental civilization in working for the common benefit of mankind, and thus, with hands across the seas, we shall weave a chain of love that shall girdle the globe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Forty years ago, at the close of the Civil War, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, then in the pride of her strength, conceived the idea of doing something to organize the mothers of the world to promote the cause of peace. What she did most of us who were born since or were children then do not know. We have asked her to come here to tell us of her work at that time and her journey through England. We are glad she has lived to see the fruition of her labors. I present to you Mrs. Julia Ward Howe.

ADDRESS OF MRS. JULIA WARD HOWE.

Mrs. President and Good Friends: In the year of the Franco-Prussian War a great awakening seemed to visit this country and Europe. The shadow of Providence had certainly moved forward on the dial of human affairs. The women roused themselves to inquire what this meant. In France a distinguished lady worked and spoke in behalf of peace. From Switzerland, also, sounded a woman's voice. I bethought me of the mothers of men, to whom fall not only the love but also the cares of human life. I felt persuaded that the greatest effort in behalf of the world's peace should be made by those who could say, "This human life which you men waste so lavishly is produced by our greatest sufferings and maintained by our cares and fatigues. To you it seems of small account, but to us it is very sacred for the sake of what it has cost us."

Once beginning to study this subject of war more profoundly, I found that the entailed fruit of it was present in all society. I knew that in our civilization, so long as selfish animal man had the upper hand, the spirit of war would continue to pervade all human intercourse. It would stir up father against son. It would stir up brother against brother. Woman, therefore, the impersonation of tender affection and watchful care, the guardian of man's infant years, appeared to me to be the natural promoter of peace. I looked for some new and valuable effort in this direction. Firm in this belief, and in the feeling that had so strongly taken possession of me, I indited a brief address to women in all parts of the world, praying them to take an active interest in the cessation of war. This address was translated into all the current languages of Europe and sent abroad.

In the year 1872 I went to England, where, aided by Mrs. Josephine Butler's advice, I journeyed far and wide. I uttered my little word in regard to the interest of women in the progress of peace. I was aided by many persons. Sir John Darling addressed my principal meeting in London. Mr. John Bright and other distinguished persons graced my platform. I then inaugurated what were called the "Mothers' Day Meetings." I chose for this purpose the second day of June, as a time of great beauty in the external world, a time in which flowers could be freely used in decorations and in which out-of-door meetings could so well be enjoyed. My suggestion of the Mothers' Day Meetings grew in certain quarters and continued for many years, and we held largely attended meetings in Boston. I observed that my second day of June was observed in remote countries, once or twice even in far-off Constantinople.

A residence of two years in Europe necessarily interrupted my work. My efforts in behalf of the world's peace had shown me that women, considered as a body, would have to make some progress before they could take any definite action in the furtherance of the desired end. They needed, first, the help of higher education in order that they might receive the aid of sound reason. In the years that followed, therefore, I devoted myself to the interests of the higher education, the suffrage, and the promotion of the principle of initiative among them. I found that a movement or an association formed at that time in New York furthered the advance of woman in the exercise of this power of active performance which man had so long exercised, but which we women did not possess.

In forecasting the results of my peace crusade, I relied too much upon the interest which it would at once awaken in every woman. Women, I speedily found, were too little accustomed to the habit of thinking. Each of them was too much of a personal sovereign holding her little court, curtained off by her little chimeras, with too little knowledge of the world's affairs. The change to the higher education, the great enlargement, the opportunity for useful and noble work, — these have produced a new social world.

The Chairman: I now have the honor to introduce to you Miss Willhelmina Sheriff Bain of New Zealand, the country where they are trying many new experiments in the interest of brotherhood, justice and peace.

REMARKS OF MISS WILLHELMINA SHERIFF BAIN.

Mrs. President and Friends: The hour is so late, and you are to listen to the Baroness von Suttner, so I will detain you with only a very few words about New Zealand.

Our native tribes were very fond of fighting. They had many splendid qualities, but the lust for war was an all-consuming fire within them. Their winters were spent in planning their summer campaigns. Their old women were given to inciting them to even greater ferocity. British settlement led to more friendly inter-tribal relations.

It abolished cannibalism and infanticide, but some fatal blunder brought about warfare between the natives and ourselves, — warfare which is now deplored by all of us alike. We are all one people now.

It may have been thought that we had gained enough bitter experience to keep us out of any further warfare; but the war in South Africa kindled anew the flames that were seemingly dead in our lovely islands. Our young men pressed forward in contingent after contingent. Our horses were sent away by thousands. Some of our boys were killed, some died lingeringly by enteric fever, some returned home to live out as best they could their altered lives. The country is still divided as to the issues of the whole miserable affair. We have fortifications all around our coast; we have battleships; and in nearly every school there is compulsory military drill; but there are many sorrowful homes which once were glad. The farmers, last harvest, complained they could not get suitable labor, and everywhere from north to south our beautiful houses are made desolate. We learn that in South Africa affairs are even worse. A friend of mine went over recently to South Africa, intending to make her home there, but quickly returned to New Zealand. And so these conditions lead to a growing realization of the futility of warfare. The love of peace for its own sake is becoming more and more freely expressed among us.

I should, perhaps, also say a word about the National Council of the Women of New Zealand, which I have the honor to represent here. That Council has stood for peace and arbitration since its first inception. Year after year it endeavors to inculcate a better public opinion by addresses and debates on peace and arbitration. It may be asserted tha it is doing excellent service in that respect. At every annual meeting it pleads for the gradual, simultaneous and proportionate reduction of armaments, and urges arbitration as the only rational mode of settling disputes, in national as well as in private affairs.

Within our own bounds New Zealand has proved the efficacy of arbitration. We have industrial tribunals that settle every disagreement between employers and employees, so that for about ten years boycots, strikes and lockouts have been unknown in our land. Any intelligent community which has thus realized the benefits of arbitration in its personal matters must in course of time logically give extension of that principle to all its relations with the world. Thus, in the remotest section of the British empire, as in this vast republic, the spirit of the new era, the spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of love is assuming definite guidance.

The Baroness von Suttner was next introduced and spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE BARONESS VON SUTTNER.

Mrs. President, and my dear American Sisters and Brothers: I have been requested to speak of the responsibilities and duties of women in this cause. I have been very deeply impressed by various things that I have heard and seen in the short stay that I have had in America — very short, for I arrived only this morning after a journey of twelve days from my own country. Still, what I have heard and seen has so deeply impressed me that I cannot restrain the desire of giving some expression to it.

This country is the cradle of the peace movement. I knew it long ago, but what I begin to realize now is to what depth and height it has grown among you, to what breadth it is expanding. Its work is fervently done on moral grounds and on scientific grounds by prominent men and earnest women. The women, especially, form a feature peculiar to you, for on the European continent the work of the women in the peace movement is not so strong as here. It is often, I might say, very weak. I have not found that on the platform where women unite to fight for their rights and for their ideals, the peace cause has been made so prominent as it has here. The International Council of Women have made this the chief subject of their propaganda, but that Council was founded in America and by an American woman. I am sorry the president of the Council, who was to have been here, is absent, and I wish to send her, from our assembly, the expression of our regret not to have her here and of our esteem for her work.

At the great congress in Berlin last June, a whole session was devoted to the peace cause, but this was not the work of the European society. It was the work, again, of our dear Mrs. Sewall. You know by the reports what a great sensation she produced, owing to her peculiar charm and the eloquence with which she pleaded for the noble cause that ought to be the bond between our sex over the whole world, — ought to be but is not, I am sorry to say, nor can we well expect it to be. Women represent the half of mankind, and certainly are quite as divided in their opinions and in their abilities as the other half, though women, certainly more than men, are prone to detest war and to be afraid of it. But there is a great deal between the detesting of a thing and the wish and endeavor to eradicate it.

Then there is the belief that the thing must be, that war is a necessity, though a dire necessity, that it is founded in the struggle of nature. This belief, which is an error, is very widely extended. Those who think thus declare that war cannot be eradicated by human will. I have heard it remarked that Christian men and women are prone to this belief, that everything must remain as it is; and for that reason we find so few Christian men among the champions of the peace movement. The leaders are rather scientists, poets, etc. At least, that is the case in Europe.

Still we do not find a large number of men ready to take a leading part in this movement. It is not a matter of sentiment; it is a matter of scientific knowledge. Only those who believe in the progress of the world, the evolution of human society, will give themselves to such a movement as ours. When they become imbued with these convictions women will join the peace movement, and do so effectively. As long as the error remains that war is a necessity, women will not join. On the contrary, they will continue to countenance war. They will stifle their maternal feelings and try to enkindle in their husbands the warlike spirit.. In the hour of national conflict, they will give moral encouragement. They will even give their personal assistance and consider themselves heroines for doing so. There is a statue erected in the Public Square of an Austrian town to a young peasant girl who, ninety years ago, when the French were storming the city, hurled down some dozen Frenchmen by stabbing them with a fork.

We are of those who consider that war is not necessary; then, not being so, that it is a crime. We consider murder a sin, and we consider war as wholesale murder, although making allowance for the great error that is in the mind of the murderer. We do not condemn as murderers the soldiers who do what they are taught.

But now, speaking to women who, by study or by intuition, do know that war is a relic of barbarism, and that men by their misguided judgment will make it continue, I want to speak to the women about their responsibility and their duty. In the contention against war women have some chance. In some spheres we have great influence and power, and if we fail to use this influence and this power in the service of what we consider the most glorious cause in the world, we commit a great sin of omission. As mothers, we have the power to lead the next generation to peace, not only by banishing out of the nursery the tin soldier and out of the schoolroom the bloody stories of warfare, but by lifting the minds of our growing sons to the realization that we live in a time where a higher and nobler civilization is being wrought out, and that theirs will be the opportunity to hasten the realization of this idea.

Now, mothers, sisters, you have another advantage over men. It is this: While a certain roughness and hardness is excusable, perhaps even desirable, in the composition of a strong man's character, the chief virtues of woman are declared to be gentleness, kind-heartedness, charity and pity. It is our privilege to show these feelings without restraint and to make them the mainspring of our actions. Let us use this privilege in the struggle against warfare. War, being the cause of the vastest sufferings, it is also the occasion for the vastest pity. Only read the reports from Port Arthur. Try to realize the depths of these horrors and your hearts must melt. While such wars are being waged, while such miseries and such cruelty are staining our earthly home, every woman should be clad in deep mourning; no woman should be seen to smile. Only imagine that nine days' battle, where fifty thousand bodies covered the ground, and where the wounded had been lying nine days without help! Only think of the men and the horses caught in the tangled wires and hanging there, as an eye witness described it, hanging there like rats caught in a trap! Think of the whole regiment blown into the air by an exploding mine,—again I quote my eye witness,—the sky darkened by the falling limbs! Imagine the heaps of twenty thousand bodies under the walls of Port Arthur, those bodies covered with chalk that they may not pollute the air! Are you sure, quite sure, that they were all corpses? In some of those miserable and wretched creatures the vestiges of life still remained.

If you read and think of those things, if you try to realize them, hatred against war must inflame your hearts and pity must pervade your souls. Fortunately human imagination is not strong enough to realize all these horrors. We can only grasp what is seen. If we could but grasp all those things I think it would make us mad. And our great pity must not be allowed to weaken our reason; it must be our strength. We can never undo what has been done, and we cannot stop what is going on, but what we can do is to help to prepare a new order in which these things will never occur again. And as we can do it, so let us do it.

The Chairman then presented to the meeting the following letter from Mrs. May Wright Sewall, President of the National Council of Women:

TO THE WOMEN'S MEETING CONVENED AS PART OF THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND ARBITRATION CONGRESS ASSEMBLED AT PARK STREET CHURCH, WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 5, 1904.

My Friends and Colleagues of many Nationalities: It is with a profound sense of regret and disappointment, and a keen appreciation of the loss which I am experiencing, that I am obliged to deny myself the pleasure of accepting the great honor of presiding over your deliberations on October 5th. I have been glad to be a member of the Committee of Organization for the Thirteenth International Peace Congress. My pleasure in this work has been limited only by my consciousness of the small degree to which I have been able to assist it.

The questions that will be brought before you are too serious, and the issues of your meeting fraught with consequences too large, to justify me in holding your attention for a single instant by a statement of the personal considerations which compel my absence. I write because I trust to the generosity of the Executive Committee and to whoever shall serve in my place as your presiding officer to allow me, notwithstanding my absence, to bring to your attention certain facts which are the basis of important propositions to which I respectfully invite your attention.

While I feel that the world is too ready to hold women responsible for whatever evils may assail society, I myself believe that the relation of women to the whole of humanity is such that if all women could be awakened to feel both the horror and the helplessness of war, if they could under the pitiless pain of this feeling be led to adopt the title of Baroness von Suttner's powerful book and issue it to the world as a command, "Lay Down Your Arms!" the world would be compelled to obey. I recognize, however, that the conviction that war is useless is not shared by the masses of women any more than by the masses of men, and that the masses can never be brought to share it except by education directed to the attainment of that conviction.

As my position upon the Executive Committee for the Thirteenth International Peace Congress was directly due to the fact that for some years I have been the chairman of the Committee on Peace and Arbitration of the National Council of Women of the United States, and as the invitation to preside at your meeting was, without doubt, directly due to the fact that I have just been elected to the chairmanship of the Committee on Peace and Arbitration of the International Council of Women, it seems to me proper to bring to your attention the program of these two bodies, particularly of the latter, which includes the former, and with it the National Councils of a score of other countries.

At the Second Quinquennial of the International Council held in London in 1899, the resolution to make propaganda work for peace and arbitration the program of the Council throughout the world was adopted by unanimous vote. At the time of the adoption of this resolution the larger part of the world was at peace. Whether the Council would have had the courage to adopt this resolution had it known that the frightful wars in South Africa and in China were so soon to engage the armies of a dozen nations can never be known, but, fortunately, it is committed to peace propaganda by that resolution. It became the official duty of the president of the International Council to keep this resolution upon the programs of the Councils of all of the affiliated nations. The result was what may be called an educational campaign participated in with greater or less sincerity and zeal by the different national organizations within the International Council.

The study of the question to which that fortunate resolution brought the women of a score of countries showed its results at the Third Quinquennial in Berlin, when at the meeting of the Executive Committee preceding the great Peace Meeting on Friday, June 10, a unanimous vote of the executive of the International Council not only confirmed the action of 1899, but also pledged the Council to a program to another part of which I beg your adhesion.

Believing in evolution as the only process, and education as the only method, by which nations can be brought into such relations to one another as are compatible with the Golden Rule, the International Council has asked each one of the affiliated National Councils to instruct its committee on peace and arbitration to make a rigid examination of all text books on the history of their own country which are being studied in its schools. This is to be done with a view to ascertaining to what degree the relative importance of war in the development of a country and the relative glory of military achievement are exaggerated in such text books. It is believed by the Peace and Arbitration Committee of the International Council that to a degree which would be appalling were it realized by the world, modern history as taught in most countries results in the development of an arrogant and vain-glorious regard for one's own country, and in contempt, resentment and hatred toward other nations. It is impossible that any but a false patriotism shall be the fruit of the study of such text books and of such instruction. It is impossible that children whose minds have been fed on distortion shall as men and women see historical events in their just proportions.

I dare not worry you with a longer presentation of the case. I hope, however, that one result of your meeting may be the permanent recognition of both individual women and organizations of women, national and international, in future peace and arbitration congresses. In order that the work of women may be effective in such congresses, it is important, if not indispensable, that there should be permanency of union in the interim of congresses. I wish, therefore, that you might consider the question of a committee which would enable the women who are united in this Congress to continue their influence after its dissolution. I do not know that there are any women among our foreign delegates excepting from China and India who come from countries in which national councils are not already formed, and as chairman of the Peace and Arbitration Committee of the International Council, I seek aid from this Congress through the committee that I have indicated. If the investigation of histories at present used, with a view to securing text books which shall give to the records of war merely their proportionate amount of space as compared with the space occupied by the other factors in national development, and which shall have expunged from their pages all of those partial presentations of events which tend to augment arrogance and to stimulate hate, meets your approval, I ask that a committee be formed instructed to coöperate with the committee of the International Council in this great labor.

Thanking you for the privilege of intimating briefly what, were I present, I should have wished to present *in extenso*,

Very faithfully yours,

MAY WRIGHT SEWALL.

Workingmen's Public Meeting in Faneuil Hall.

Wednesday Evening, October 5.

THE INTERESTS OF LABOR IN INTERNATIONAL PEACE.

MR. GEORGE E. MCNEILL of Boston called the meeting to order at 8 o'clock, and said:

It is my privilege to have the triple duty of calling this meeting to order, of reading the resolutions, and of introducing the distinguished Chairman of the meeting.

Organized labor is always ready to speak for that peace that comes with justice, and is equipped to do its share of the work of organizing civilization, advocating righteousness, and educating the people in the science of ethical economics.

The Peace Congress now assembled in our beloved city has subdivided its activities. To-night the business men meet in Tremont Temple, the women in Park Street Church, and we of the labor movement in Faneuil Hall. If the other subdivisions meet in sacred halls, we meet in one no less sacred, for this is the temple of liberty, fraternity and equality. From this platform have gone forth the words of light and life to all peoples. Let us speak in no uncertain terms. It is our right and duty to speak the word as we see it, to enlarge our faith and quicken our hope in the work in which, as Trade Unionists, we are engaged. War is hell, and war is the monster son of greed and injustice. Peace is heaven, for peace is the divine child of love and justice. Let us have peace, and, as Webster said that "liberty and union are one and inseparable," so may we say that peace and justice, now and forever, are one and inseparable.

I now offer the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we endorse and emphasize the declaration for international peace made by the American Federation of Labor, in convention assembled at Baltimore in 1887; that the declaration then made was but the natural sequence of the demand of organized labor for justice.

Resolved, That trade unionism makes for peace, and that non-unionism makes for war; that all attempts to disrupt the Trade Union movement are attempts against the orderly coöperative effort of wage workers to secure justice and equity; that we seek peace not by the sword, but by justice; that justice to labor means justice to all.

Resolved, That in the name of organized labor everywhere we protest against the slaughter of our brothers at the behest of the principalities and powers of governments, of industry, and of trade and commerce; that we do not and will not submit, without urgent protest, to the furnishing of men and money for wars of aggrandizement and greed, whether such wars are of one nation against another nation, or of a nation against a subject people, or of a government (as in the State of Colorado) against a peaceful association of sovereign citizens.

Resolved, That the Declaration of Independence was a proclamation of peace and not of war, and that the acceptance of the declaration that all men are born possessed of certain unalienable rights, among which are the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, will hasten the dawn of peace to all people.

Resolved, That, as it is wicked and foolish to cry peace, peace, when there is no peace, so is it wicked and foolish to advocate peace between nations, and be silent when men are killed or driven home by governmental authority at the behest of a mining oligarchy.

Resolved, That, as peace comes only with justice and equity, we, of the organized labor men here in Fanueil Hall assembled, do pledge ourselves to aid the Peace Conference now assembled in Boston in every effort that they make to stay the bloody hand of war, and we ask the Peace Conference and all peace loving men and women to join with us in our efforts to secure justice and equity to the wage workers of the world.

Resolved, That we welcome our brothers from abroad as comrades in the grand army of peace and fellow citizens in the great world of labor.

Resolved, That a committee consisting of the chairman of this meeting and others to be appointed by him be authorized to present these resolutions to the Peace Conference.

It is indeed a pleasant privilege to introduce the Chairman of this meeting. He has been my friend for a third of a century. If that were all, I would love him for himself, but in the years that have passed he has proven himself to be a true friend and leader in the labor movement, unexcelled in the qualities of leadership. The history of the labor movement, when it shall be written, will contain the names of many noble men and women, and of them all none will fill a larger space than Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF SAMUEL GOMPERS ON TAKING THE CHAIR.

Mr. McNeil, Ladies and Gentlemen: Permit me to express my keen appreciation, Mr. Chairman, of your kind words and commendation of whatever effort I have been able to give to the labor movement of our country and of our time, and also to you, ladies and gentlemen, for your more than cordial reception. I am especially pleased to have the honor of presiding over you this evening in Faneuil Hall. This meeting betokens the continuation of that effort of the working people of America, as it betokens the continued effort of the working people of Europe, who are determined that justice shall prevail. There is no man who realizes the consequences of struggle and contest and strife, but who seeks peace and loves peace. It is because the Trade Unionists, the men and women of labor, are required to bear the brunt of contest, both internationally and industrially, that their efforts are devoted to the establishment of peace.

We realize, however, that the declaration for peace is meaningless unless it is peace founded upon the principles of justice and right. War to us is, as it has been described by our dear friend and comrade, Brother McNeil, in the resolutions which he read to us, — war to us is hell, and one of the masters in the art of war coined that phrase which will live in the memories of men so long as the spirit of right and justice, and the desire for human welfare, shall prevail; war, with all its attendant horrors and brutalities, calling forth all that is base in our natures, stimulating the brute that is in man, giving an exhibition to the world of all that is hateful in our dispositions, and subordinating every impulse of humanity; war, with the countless millions of men sent to untimely graves, and the countless widows and orphans left in its wake; war, which brings together men of different countries, who know not the color of the eye of their supposed foe, who bear them no malice or ill-will, in deadly array, and urged on to their mutual destruction.

It is enough to make the heart grow sick to think that in this year of grace, 1904, with all our supposed civilization and progress, we are yet confronted with war, and with wars that may yet come. War is now a blot upon the escutcheon of any country claiming to be aligned with those calling themselves civilized. The wars of nations upon nations have been seldom conducted for the maintenance or the establishment of a principle of justice or right. Greed and avarice and aggrandizement, the lust of power and wealth, are the incentives to war, and have been the incentives from time immemorial. Call it by what other name any one may please, give it the gilding of valor and courage and heroism, in the last analysis it is nothing but international murder. And because we are opposed to war, we utilize every opportunity at our command, and create opportunities where none exist, so that the enlightened conscience of the people shall reach that acme of advancement that the nation which shall wantonly go to war, or provoke war, shall be an outcast in the civilization of the world.

We, as working men and working women, who have at least manifested enough intelligence to try to safeguard and protect our interest, and undertake to advance and promote it, — we not only realize that there is war and that wars are imminent daily between nations, but we know also that the great army of labor is usually called in to make the fighting forces of the nations; that, in the sum total, the largest number of men who fight the battles and are called upon to sacrifice their lives come from the mill and the mine and the workshop and the field of labor.

We not only realize the wrong of international strife and war, but we also realize the fact that we are confronted often with industrial war. We cannot afford to ignore the industrial wars with which the working people are confronted. We know also that the greatest factor that makes for and insures, at least to some degree, international and industrial peace, is the organization of the working people. There will be less and less of the industrial wars in the same ratio that the working people join the unions of their trades. The entwining of their hearts and interests with their fellows in these unions will make for absolute and universal peace.

While many of our friends engaged in the effort to secure peace between the nations of the earth are prompted by serious motives and purposes, and their work is appreciated to the fullest by the men engaged in the labor movement of the world, yet I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that the greatest element that will make for the abolition of international war will be the organization of the forces of labor internationally. When the workers of all lands shall be so thoroughly organized and united and federated that the same heart throb will be felt by each and all alike, then those who may want to provoke wars will find themselves minus the men who would make the soldiers. The international organizations of labor with their fraternal delegates, with the larger view of the attitude which each man ought to hold to his fellow man, will go to make up a bond of unity, a bond of fraternity, that will make powerfully for the peace of the world.

In that hope, with that object before us, let us work in order that to-day may be a step in advance of yesterday, and that to-morrow and the next day may be still further steps toward the goal of universal peace and brotherhood, for men and women who give the very best efforts of which they are capable. In that spirit and in that hope, this meeting will do much to accelerate it.

I shall not take more of your time now, but will introduce to you the first speaker of the evening, a man who comes from Great Britain, with the credentials of the British Trade Union Congress and the credentials of the Federation of Trade Unions of Great Britain, representing in the aggregate nearly two million organized workmen, Mr. Pete Curran, who will now address you.

ADDRESS OF MR. PETE CURRAN OF ENGLAND.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am here to-night to express the earnest wish and desire of nearly two millions of organized workmen in Great Britain that international peace shall be established at the earliest opportunity. We, in Great Britain, in the organized labor world, are very strong and very emphatic on the establishment of international peace. That is because we have been frequently the victims of war.

Three years ago, in Great Britain, our statesmen, joining hands with the capitalistic forces of South Africa, plunged Great Britain into a war with the two Boer republics. That war cost the wealth producers of Great Britain two hundred and fifty million pounds and twenty-eight thousand lives; and the return for two hundred and fifty million pounds and twenty-eight thousand lives, — the return to the wealth producers of Great Britain is that the capitalist is bringing into South Africa the Chinaman and other foreigners to do the work which should properly be done by the English workman.

War is essentially a working class question. In the Peace Congress which is being held at the Tremont Temple there are men of great literary ability, there are ecclesiastics of high order, there are commercial men and men from various other spheres of life and estate, and I know they will join with me when I say that international warfare is more an industrial question than it is a commercial question. Directly and indirectly, the workman pays the whole of the war tax. If the war tax is paid by the commercial man, or the ecclesiastic, the banker or the stock broker, they have first to get that tax out of the industrial class. We have to supply the money and we have to supply the men. The twenty-eight thousand men who were stretched upon the veldt in South Africa did not belong to the upper class in England, nor to the middle class; they were the sons of the industrial artisans of the United Kingdom. Now if we have to supply the men and the money and have the peculiar legislation round our necks that we have to-day, compelling us to pay for war, then I say we ought to be the first to raise our voices on behalf of international disarmament.

You people in America are just afflicted with the same sort of patriotism that we have been afflicted with in the old country. I have told you about the men and the money that we have sacrificed for the purpose of enriching the Rand capitalists in South Africa. I want to ask you American taxpayers what is going to be your net gain from the annexation of the Philippine Islands. What is the net gain to the American people now that the American flag waves over Porto Rico? The same gain that we have got for our South African exploits will be your gain in America for what you have been doing. We are disgusted in England, especially when an election comes round. We have our capitalists, who label themselves with various names, but they are capitalists first and politicians afterwards. They tell us we ought to be imbued with enthusiasm, that we are citizens of a mighty country, a great empire, upon which the sun never sets. That is a great stock political phrase, Mr. Chairman, when the election is coming round. But those fellows never tell us that there are blood spots on our empire where the sun never shines. Our territory is large enough already, and yours is large enough already. An old writer once said, "It is not the building of battleships or the equipment of great armies that brings about an honest prosperity; but the well being and the prosperity of the nation are built upon the moral and intellectual manhood and womanhood that makes up the community." [Great applause.]

Annexation is a great term now. I noticed in the American papers, during the Philippine struggle, that you were going to annex the Philippine Islands. We have annexed the two Boer republics. That is a kind of new word for stealing. My friends, we want to put an end to this sort of theft which is called annexation, and we want men who do not carry peace on their lips and war in their hearts to represent us. The Czar of Russia, above all men, is a very religious man. He called a conference some five years ago, and he invited the whole of the universe and called in the aid of the Deity to help him in establishing international peace. At the very same time that these statements were made by him, his government was going on with the theft of territory that brought about the present

Japanese war. Your American statesmen talk about peace, and then they proceed to build battleships.

Some people say that the best way to secure an established peace is to prepare for war. I beg leave to repudiate that statement. What we want is not to prepare for war, but to spend the money which is to-day being lavishly spent on war preparations in opening up industrial, useful pursuits for the people who are starving in our large cities. There are some people taking part in this Peace Congress,— and I believe they are just as sincere and as well meaning as I am myself (I claim the right of calling myself sincere and honest in this business),— good, honest, sincere men, who believe that we can moralize the world into a true recognition of peace. I cannot subscribe to that idea. The greed of annexation is born of commercial greed, and as long as you in America and we in Great Britain leave the law making, national and international, in the hands of the landlord and capitalist class, so long will there be international war. The greed which prompts your trusts to try and annex every other trust of a similar character, that very same desire which prompts your big trust to swallow up the small one, prompts the statesman in the large nations to try and swallow up the small nations. The consequence is that it will be a difficult job to moralize these fellows into the idea of establishing international peace. The workers of the world will have to take hold of this business and carry it through, and in my judgment it will be left with the world's democracy to dethrone king capital and monopoly, and to establish international amity and peace by international industrial relations of the working people.

I wish to say, in conclusion, that in Great Britain, in the labor movement, we have unanimously raised our voices on behalf of peace. We are going to do more. We are going to try and sweep out of power the class of statesmen who have created the wars during the last quarter of a century. We ask the American workmen to combine with us, which it is their right and their duty to do. Every man and every woman in this room, whether politicians or nondescript, if they work for wages, ought to belong to the union that is most appropriate to their calling, and if there is anything wrong in that union, let them, instead of going outside to talk about it, stay inside and try to make it right. I ask you in addition to that to organize with people in the old country.

There is another kind of war that has been already touched upon, and ably touched upon, by the President — industrial war. You have had your Cripple Creek and your Colorado. You have had the militia and the reserves of your government called out, not to protect the union man, but to protect scab labor when it was not necessary. That applies just the same in the old country as it does here. That is because class privilege and monopoly is at the head of government in this country just as it is in the old country, and I say that not only should you organize in your trade unions, but you should also use your power of citizenship to send men into these responsible positions of government who believe in international peace, who believe in the brotherhood of man, and who believe in establishing useful commercial and industrial relations of a friendly character throughout the entire civilized world. [Loud applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: We have with us at this meeting a gentleman from Belgium who is in attendance at the International Peace Congress, Senator Henri La Fontaine, who will now address you.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR HENRI LA FONTAINE.

My Friends: I speak but bad English, and the words I know are not many, so I am obliged to make a short speech. After the eloquent words which our comrade of Great Britain has pronounced, it is very difficult to utter as eloquent ones as he, but it will be interesting for you to know the situation of the labor party in my country.

Belgium is, as you know, a very small nation. It is of about the same size as the State of New York, and it has six million inhabitants. We have about two hundred and seventeen inhabitants per square mile, and in some parts you will find five hundred people living on a square mile. Our working men are very strongly organized. They live together; they stick to one another; they discuss their interests against the capitalists, and you know that in Belgium the working people can do what our friend said the working people of England will do. We have now more than thirty representatives in the Chamber of Representatives. The first part of the representation in our Congress are workingmen, or men representing the working class, and even in our Senate we have six Socialists, representing the working class. I think it is the only country where there are Socialist Senators. I am one of them.

It is unnecessary to say to you that we are against war. In our country we have not to suffer so much as in the larger countries of Europe from army and navy. We have no navy, and our army is very small. It is organized on the substitutional-conscriptive system. It is the only country where that system exists now. The men who must go to the army are chosen by lot. All the young men from eighteen to nineteen years of age, at a certain day in the year, come and must draw a number in a great box, and the men who have taken the low numbers must go to the army. But the rich people who get a bad number can get another man in their place, so that our army is composed only from the poorest. That is a very good thing for the Socialists, because we can make propaganda with great success in the army.

In our line we are as free as you here in America, and we can make a propaganda. The young men of our Socialist party are constituted in what we call little groups in every town, so that we can make such propaganda. We send everywhere papers in which we raise our protest against the army as strongly as it is possible. Certain of our workers have said things so strong that they went to prison. But in the last few years we have decided not to say certain things, and the success of our propaganda is very great in the army. We have a little country, but we work very strongly against war, and we are obliged to do so. Our small countries suffer very much from the large armaments of the countries around us, even from the armaments of France and of Germany. These countries are obliged to get money for the army, and they have imposed very large taxes on industrial products, and in Belgium we are suffering very much from that situation. Our industrial capitalists are obliged to pay small wages to the workingmen in order to make a profit.

Now, as you know, in the last elections, the Socialist party did not have the same success as the first time. We lost three of our representatives in parliament. The cause of it is that we have a very curious system of suffrage in Belgium. Here you have general suffrage, and one man has one vote. In most of the other countries they have the same system of general suffrage. In Belgium it is not so. The poor man has one vote, the rich man has three votes, and the middle man has two votes. If in Belgium we could have one vote for each man, we should not have thirty-two representatives in Parliament, but we should have fifty. The capitalist class fears so much that we should become stronger than they in the parliament that they have taken the precaution to head us off in our county elections — in our county elections our rich men have four votes.

In the capital of Belgium, Brussels, the Socialists form a third part of the representatives, and if we had a single vote for a single man, we should have in Brussels a Socialist majority. Here in America, frequently, the workingmen have their own candidate for President. We Belgians think that it would be a great thing for the working party here in America, and that it would do much towards putting an end to war, if they would organize a special party, the workingmen's party, and have their own candidates at all elections, municipal, county, state and national.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman that I shall now introduce to you is also a delegate to the International Peace Congress and a member of the Social Democratic Federation of Great Britain, Mr. Herbert Burrows.

ADDRESS OF MR. HERBERT BURROWS.

Mr. Chairman, Comrades and Friends: I have to join myself heartily with my old and true friend and fellow-worker, Pete Curran, in bringing to you the fraternal greetings of the English workers. I am glad to see all these women in this audience to-night, for two reasons. First of all, because peace is essentially a woman's question more than a man's; and next, because I represent here to-night fifty thousand women Trade Unionists. I also represent — and I am sure the women will excuse me for saying this — a movement which I helped to found in England some three and twenty years ago, the

Social Democratic Federation; and in everything I shall have to say to you I shall speak as a Social Democrat, and also as president of a trade union. I would not give two pence for a man or woman who professes Socialism with the lips and who has not got the courage and determination to join the union in their respective trades. We want both things together, and I am one of those who go about the world, to as many countries as I can, trying to join together the Socialist and the Trade Union movements, because when the two are combined there will be a responsible effort to secure peace the wide world over.

I have spoken during the last forty years in many countries of the world and in many places, and I can honestly say to you American people that never did I feel the responsibility of speaking that I feel to-night in this hall. Yesterday, under the able and friendly guidance of my friend, the editor of the *Boston Herald*, I went around Revolutionary Boston. Its history was as familiar to me, as an Englishman, as to you, and I joined myself, as a revolutionary Social Democrat, in every revolutionary idea that my friend put forth. Revolutionary history here in Boston centres around this hall. It has been well called the Cradle of Liberty, and when I look on these walls and hear the echoes of the words of some of the greatest men that the world has produced, — Channing, Emerson, Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, — I feel a very heavy responsibility in speaking on the peace movement and in endeavoring to give to you my best thoughts in regard to this question.

Now there is not a man or a woman in the world who, I believe, would get up on any platform and say they wanted war instead of peace; that they were getting tired and sick of the comforts of peace. Now we want to continue in this peace movement, and we want it brought down to a practical basis; therefore I repeat the words of my friend Curran, that this is essentially an industrial question for the men and women workers of the world, if it is to be settled satisfactorily. In the advancement of peace I shall hope for much from the organized trades. I do not hope for anything from the capitalists. I look to the workers of the countries as a whole to join themselves together in their industrial organizations and to make up their minds that we shall cease fighting henceforth and forever. [Applause.]

What does industrial war mean? What does your Colorado and and your Cripple Creek mean? It is war, and the worst form of war. It is as brutal as that fight we read of the other day in the Russian-Japanese war, when a Russian officer and a Japanse soldier were found locked in the death grip, with the Japanese having a clutch upon the throat of the Russian officer, and with the Russian officer's thumbs gouging out the eyes of the Japanese. That occurred away in the Far East, but it is as bad and worse in Colorado and Cripple Creek. Oh, you shiver; that is horrible. But here, at home in America, as in England, — here in Colorado and Cripple Creek, — you have got that brutality going on, in the highest form of civilization the world has ever seen.

I appeal to the Trade Unionists here who are not Socialists, and I appeal to the middle-class people, too. What is the reason of the Colorado and the Cripple Creek business? It is the reason that lies behind the whole propaganda of social democracy. It is slavery. Eleven years ago I had the pleasure of standing, on Labor Day, in Chicago, with my friend, the president of this meeting, on the platform with the governor of Illinois and with Carter Harrison, and I told the people then — and I got well hit by the papers for saying it — that the workmen were living, as we were living in the old country, in a comparative state of slavery. Why? Because the rich class who own the means by which we live can control our lives.

Oh, but you say you have political equality! If that is so, why your struggle? It is inherent in the social organization of America, as it is in that of every other country of the world. You have in America the best political constitution the world has ever seen since old Greek times, and yet your social evils here at home, your Colorado business, is infinitely worse than anything we have had before. I cut out of the *Boston Advertiser* yesterday a decision of Judge Swartz. A railroad man had been on duty twenty-two hours, and he went to sleep. He was arrested, and Judge Swartz declared in his decision that in case the man had the right to work on a railroad, if he was in faint physical condition and liable to fall asleep, no matter from what cause, he should discontinue work, even though he should lose his position, rather than jeopardize human life by continuing on duty. Not a word was said by Judge Swartz to the railroad which worked that man twenty-two hours without rest.

Now that sort of work is not freedom; it is industrial slavery; and I am here to-night to say that that is part of the peace question. If it is part of the peace question, then to have peace we must abolish industrial slavery. That can only be abolished in one way. I agree with my friend, the president, that you can solve a great many of the questions which confront you by keeping together at the ballot box. But why leave all the weapons with the other fellow. If the ballot box is good for Morgan and Rockefeller, it is good for you. There is no doubt about that. The fact is, you have got to use all sound methods in order to advance yourself in the line of social and industrial progress. Industrial war, as I was saying, must be abolished, and it can be abolished only by the people taking the social and industrial power into their own hands, and working it collectively, not for their own selfish individual advantage, but for the advantage of the community at large. That is a big problem, and is n't going to be settled to-day or to-morrow, but what we want you to do towards industrial peace is exactly what the Peace Congress is asking with regard to their phase of the peace question. We want you to make a beginning.

Now, if that be so, then it rests on every individual man and woman in all the communities of the world to take the subject home to themselves. You cannot do the work alone. You must move together as one force. You must use your power sanely, intelligently, as educated, thinking human beings. I know the goal cannot be reached in a day, but I have sufficient faith in human nature to believe that this peace movement, industrially as well as socially, which is making rapid and gigantic strides in every country of the world, will not fail of success. A share of the responsibility for its success rests on each man and woman, in your country as in all others.

You American workmen do as the workmen do in my own country. You condemn the rich; not because they are rich, but because of the way they got their wealth. You condemn their luxury; you condemn their debauchery; but I want to advise you, — you who belong to the working classes, — take care that your own lives be cleanly and pure before you cast any reflections. Be very careful of that, for that is the first step towards the abolition of industrial war. You must remember, as we are trying to do to-day in our Peace Congress, that the greatest power in all the world is not the rifle or the bayonet. It is the power of thought. Thought is going to solve this question.

Allow me to give you, as an illustration of what I mean, an incident which happened five or six years ago. I went from London as a special delegate to attend the funeral of a great man — a man who had done more for labor and social democracy in his lifetime than any other man that I know of. We took his coffin down from the fourth story, where he had lived for many years, and we took it into the street, and for the first time the German Kaiser was wise enough to keep his soldiers and his police out of the city. Five thousand delegates were sent from all over the world. Behind his bier marched ten thousand solid, sturdy, determined German men and women, Social Democrats. We marched through Berlin ten miles. In the cemetery we found six thousand of his constituents waiting for us. We talked over his grave, representatives from every country, and then the coffin made its way, borne on the shoulders of his faithful comrades, through the winding paths of the cemetery, to his modest grave. I could see the city of Berlin a short distance away, the city of the Kaiser, that we had left behind, but the rays of the setting sun were illumining Berlin, and they were reflected back on to the coffin of Wilhelm Liebknecht. I could n't help thinking, as I stood there, of the depth of the power of that socialistic thought which had been that man's inspirer all his life. The dead man in his coffin was mightier than the Kaiser on his throne.

Industrial war can be abolished if you will only realize the power of thought, the power of industrial combination, the power of democracy; and I, for one, have sufficient faith in human nature to believe that the great time is not to be deferred for ages.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now have the pleasure of introducing to you another gentleman who is in attendance at the International Peace Congress, a representative from France, M. Claude Gignoux. Mr. Smith of England will interpret to you what Mr. Gignoux says.

REMARKS OF M. CLAUDE GIGNOUX.

On landing in this country I at once realized how great was my loss not to understand or to be able to speak the English language, and I feel it still more keenly now that the duty devolves upon me to express to you, on behalf of the workers of France, how heartily they join in your efforts to secure international peace.

The workers of France, the organized workers of France and the Trade Unionists of France all claim their right to take an active part with you in the international efforts to be made to secure peace throughout the world. You have for a long time experienced what can be done under the method which has been in vogue in the past. Now, try and see what power you can gain among the people by preaching the gospel of international solidarity. The French workers are unanimously for peace. They know from repeated experiences that they have only to lose through war. When was ever any advantage gained, any increase placed in the pockets of the workingmen, through a war. In France we have had the experience of the terrible Franco-German war. It may be said that, while the Frenchmen were defeated, so that they could not expect much, yet the Germans, who were victorious,— what benefit did the Germans get out of their victory over France? They got this benefit: that whereas in 1848 there was some hope of freedom in Germany, after the victories over France all hope of freedom disappeared, and a greater tyranny reigned over that country than ever reigned before. What advantage was brought to the working classes of Germany in return for the war in which they won victories in France? And what do you think the working classes of Japan and Russia will get as a result of the war now waging, whoever may be victorious? What compensation can victory ever give to the widow and orphan?

Never has war been a benefit. Therefore the French workingmen have sent me here to preach to you the sacred doctrine of solidarity. Nothing can effect one without affecting all. War anywhere is injury everywhere. One of the most encouraging things that I have seen since my arrival in America is the fact that the great and well-organized Federation of Labor in this country, and its president, the president of this meeting, are as one in their endeavor to secure peace.

While the working classes, by such an organization as the Federation of Labor, are endeavoring to obtain some slight share of this world's comforts, we have ambitious statesmen and others who conspire to bring about war, and this will sweep away at once any such advantage. If in Europe the wages are lower and the hours of labor longer than in America, this, in a great measure, is due to the fact that in Europe there are older war debts, more past wars, that have still got to be paid for.

And how strange is the contradiction of men of science, who are devoting their brains and intelligence to discover means for preserving human life, for securing public health, for improving our existence in that way, and yet, at the behest of the state, are inventing fresh weapons of destruction. Surely this is a disgrace to our civilization.

And then we have millions preaching peace everywhere, where there is no peace. We have statesmen making all manner of grand declarations of how anxious they are to preserve peace, and yet fresh wars are continually breaking out.

It is time to try another policy ; it is time to appeal to other leaders ; and what religion has failed to do, what the states have failed to do, the organized workers of this world must and will accomplish. You, as a people, belong to a republic exercising universal suffrage, and you can therefore influence your government. We of the French republic, with universal suffrage, can influence our government. We are doing so in France. The Socialists are doing so in favor of peace. It is for you to do so in America and bring about peace. Then the two republics, the republic of the United States and the republic of France, hand in hand, can help other nations, and in doing so, in helping those who are struggling against greater odds than we have to overcome, we shall help the less fortunate to be more fortunate, we shall ultimately bring about equality throughout the world, the solidarity of mankind in a universal republic.

The Chairman: I now have the pleasure of introducing to you. as the next speaker, one who I am very sure needs no introduction The mere presentation of her name is sufficient. She has given her life, and has not tired of work for the benefit of her fellows. I refer to Miss Jane Addams of Chicago.

ADDRESS OF MISS JANE ADDAMS.

Mr. Chairman: We have been saying, over in the women's meeting at the Park Street Church, that the thing that is incumbent on this generation is to discover a moral substitute for war, something that will appeal to the courage, the capacity of men, something which will develop their finest powers without deteriorating their moral nature, as war constantly does.

The last speaker said he believed that the people who would eventually bring peace to the world, political peace and industrial peace, would be the workers of the world. I should like to go a little further and say that the only outlook which many of us see when we anxiously scan the horizon in every direction, the only visible beginning which we can find for a moral substitute for war, is to be found in the labor movement as it is developing in every land on the face of the earth.

The first people to conceive the need of modern internationalism was, as you well know, an association of workingmen. They were organized in London in 1864, and they called themselves simply this: An International Association of Workingmen. What did they say at their third meeting in Brussels, which was held, I believe, in 1868? They recommended in their resolutions to the workingmen that when war was declared between two countries all the workingmen of both should call a strike. What did they further say? They said that back of all the governmental officers, back of all the talk, back of all the diplomacy, the people that worked with their hands were the nation, and they alone should control the destiny of the nation. And what has come about now? If the Emperor of Germany should to-morrow, in case of a great war, have to call out not only his standing army, but also the reserves, he would produce what would amount to an industrial strike of all the men in Germany. They would leave the factories, the shops, their professions, and the universities, and the Emperor would be surprised to find himself the leader of a tremendous strike.

Now, how has this come about? Many times in these meetings we have heard pretty sermons— pretty definitions of war; but Von Moltke, the great German soldier, also gave us a definition of war; and his definition was that war is just simple destruction, destruction of life and destruction of property. Who should protest against this destruction? Who should band together for preserving human life, for keeping the fields free from the tramping of soldiers, from the destruction of the precious bread that men love to have? I say it is the workers, who year after year nourish and bring up the bulk of the nation. Are not they the people who stand over against the soldier who destroys? The peace movement should be in the hands of those who produce, and not be allowed to fall into the hands of those who destroy.

Let us imagine for one instant the great moral change which would come over all the world if people all worked with their hands. It would be something like the moral change which came over Count Tolstoy when he quit being a soldier and went to work on his estate. Suddenly there came about in him that which religious people call conversion. He suddenly saw that the man at the bottom was the man who is the saviour of life, because he labors, because he produces. As things are now he labors too much. He has to wear himself out with work; he has n't enough to feed his children; he has n't decent conditions under which to perform his work. But in spite of that he has the great blessing of labor, and that in itself is a source of life; it is the source of moral life as well as physical life. And it would seem to me that the men who represent labor in this large convention which is at present assembled in three halls in this city might say to themselves: We hold within our power that which will eventually make for universal peace.

There is enough grain produced each year to feed all the children of the world, not merely to keep them alive, as we do now, but to nourish them in mind and body. We shall come to the point some day when all human labor will be considered so valuable, and human life so important, because it contributes to the great process of civilization, that we will not allow any man, during the prime of his life, to be shot down, nor allow him to go forth to kill his fellow men.

The Chairman: I now take pleasure in presenting to you a man who has given his entire life to study and work in the labor movement; a man fully qualified to address himself to the subject of international peace, industrial peace and human brotherhood, the First Vice-President of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. James Duncan.

ADDRESS OF JAMES DUNCAN.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It affords me great pleasure to stand upon this platform this evening and say a word in favor of the resolutions which have been read by our distinguished friend, George H. McNeil. I had the honor as well as the privilege of representing my union in the Baltimore Convention in 1887, to which he refers, and which declared for the resolutions read to-night. These have played their part in bringing about less war and more peace. I shall vote for them as heartily to-night as I did in 1887, and I am glad to have lived this long, to know that the sentiment then expressed, and unanimously so, by my colleagues in that convention is bearing good fruit throughout the United States of America and throughout the world. It gives me pleasure to meet these representatives of labor from abroad and the sympathizers and friends who are with us to-night, and to add a word for the great movement on behalf of peace, national and international.

There is no movement in the Western world that has so strenuously stood for peace as has the trade union movement. It not only has stood for it in an industrial way, but it is endeavoring to point the way for it outside of the industrial field. We present at the present time to the world at large a system of trade agreements for the prevention of strikes in the industrial field; and the unions that are best organized and have the best systems of agreements have the fewest strikes. In each of these agreements we find a clause inserted which will, when the people of the world, the working people of the world, get well acquainted with it, come pretty near taking the place of war as it is carried on between nations at the present time. We meet and agree to a certain scale of working conditions. In case something arises during the life of the agreement or connected therewith, not well understood, we provide that a certain number of representatives from each side shall meet and endeavor to settle the matter without a strike or a lockout; and therefore without a suspension of work.

In the event of the representatives of the workers and their employers failing to agree, we yet have a remedy beyond that. We have in that same clause in these agreements a provision that a third party shall be called in, who shall act as a conciliator or an arbitrator upon the dispute, and his decision shall be final.

If the great powers of the world — and I hope that our own country will be the first to adopt the principle of the trade union agreement — if the great powers of the world will adopt that clause, that form of settlement of disputes that is paramount in the trade agreements in the United States, in Great Britain, on the continent of Europe, and elsewhere where men are fairly well organized, we shall hear less of war and more of peace.

Nor are we unmindful of the fact that education must be plentiful in the communities where working people are found, in order to protect our liberties and to make the advances which we expect to make. The Trade Unionists stand for free and compulsory education; and there is not a city in these United States of America where it is not a fact that they have been the foremost to advocate that system until it has been adopted. The best abilities we can command, the greatest energy we can supply, is being given at the present time to introduce the system of free and compulsory education in these cities where it does not now obtain; and we are not going to let go until every city from the Atlantic to the Pacific has a law passed that every healthy male and female child shall at least have the opportunity of a fair education. We are building the ground work for a future organization built upon education; we will ultimately present to the world the greatest practicable system of eliminating war and introducing, as near as possible, universal peace. The weapons of the trade union movement, my friends, are the public schools and Webster's dictionary. [Applause.] We want no guns or bayonets in our movement; they are distasteful to us. We even look askance on the high school cadets, to whom their teachers give mock weapons of war, that they may imitate soldiers on the battlefield. We are opposed to that, and I do not know that there is an organization in the United States of America at the present time that is on record as being opposed to that system excepting the trade union movement of the country. We want to protect the public school system. We want to have upon the playground, as well as on the inside of the school, love, fraternity and good fellowship by the one child towards the other. [Applause.] We do not want them paraded upon our public avenues and the playgrounds, either with carbines or painted guns, putting into their heads the notion that one of the purposes of the school system of our country is to train them to kill other human beings.

In the industrial field we are taking care of another kind of war. If there is one kind of war that is of more concern to us at the present time than any other, it is the system of taking our small boys and girls at tender ages and rushing them into the mills and making them a part of the machinery of our corporations. In this, as well as in other things, our trade union movement stands out in bold relief. I might present to you the condition of affairs in that corporation-ridden state of New Jersey, where it has been so difficult to get an anti-child-labor law passed. The Trade Unionists there stand up so grandly above the legislators and their laws that comparison is almost out of the question. The Trade Unionists in New Jersey say, in the laws of their unions, that they will not work alongside of child labor. Failing in their attempts to secure proper legislation in regard to this serious question, they have resolved in their conventions and in their organizations in favor of a better system of humanity and progress and peace.

It is true that the peculiar system under which we live, my friends, has produced a great many big men, full of high thought; and I am sure, had he lived a little longer, our friend, Samuel M. Jones of Toledo, "Golden Rule" Jones, would have been at this Peace Congress representing not only his own especial kind of Golden Rule, but the trade union movement as we understand it. The last time I met the good man was on the platform of the New Orleans Convention of the American Federation of Labor, and he told me it was the happiest moment of his life. Our movement has attracted such men as Jones, and many hundreds of others, who are helping to make the world better. They are doing the very best they can, and are getting excellent results. Our friend Jones, before he was Mayor of Toledo, had the proud position of being a judge. The people loved him, and why should they not have done so? One day, while he was judge in his court, a poor fellow was dragged into it, and the charge presented to the judge was that he had been found in the act of stealing. The judge asked what he had stolen. He was told that he had broken a window and stolen a loaf of bread. What do you suppose our friend Jones did on that occasion? With a wave of his hand, and without waiting for a thought, he fined every one in court ten cents and himself a dollar, because they lived under a condition where it was necessary for a man to break a window to get a bite of bread to eat.

To be helpful is the purpose of the trade union movement. Our trades unions declare that women shall be paid the same rate for equal work performed as men. There is n't any other organization that I know of that so declares, and so places women where they should be, upon the same broad, fair and equal platform with the male sex.

I do not care to take up your time any longer, but I want to say to the peace delegates who are gathered here to-night, in behalf of the trade union movement, that it will always be found in the front rank, struggling for peace and endeavoring to get rid of war. You know that we have declared against a standing army, against an increase of the standing army of the United States. We have done everything that we possibly could do, and will continue to do everything in our power.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the resolutions which have been read by Mr. McNeil. You have heard them discussed from several viewpoints. I need add nothing to them nor any advocacy of their adoption. I shall submit them to you for a vote, as they were read.

[The resolutions were put to a vote and unanimously adopted].

I thank you. This meeting stands adjourned in the hope of international peace and brotherhood.

Third Business Session.

Thursday Morning, October 6, 1904.

The President called the Congress to order at 10 o'clock, and read a resolution he had received signed by the President and Adjutant of the Twenty-Third Massachusetts Regiment Association of Salem, in favor of peace and arbitration.

The Secretary presented various letters and telegrams of greeting to the Congress. These are summarized with others at the end of the account of the first business session.

A report from Committee B on Treaties of Arbitration was then presented by Mr. J. G. Alexander.

REMARKS OF J. G. ALEXANDER.

Let me first summarize for you an extremely valuable and exhaustive report which comes to us from the Peace Bureau in Berne. In accordance, I believe, with instructions given by the last Congress, that Bureau has been collecting material from different nationalities as to progress made on this subject. I think you will like to know here the questions which the Berne Bureau put to the Peace Societies in different countries. They were:

> "What permanent arbitration treaties have been concluded by your country? What is, in your country, the general opinion as regards the value of such treaties? What are the states with which your country would have most interest in concluding such treaties at an early date? Would people be disposed in your country to refer disputes to the Hague Court, or to special tribunals? Is there a disposition in your country to refer all disputes to international arbitration, or are people anxious to exclude questions considered to touch national honor? Can you specify the treaties of commerce and other treaties which contain arbitral clauses?"

Well, now, to that series of questions answers have been received from Germany, from the German Peace Society, represented by our distinguished colleague, Dr. Richter; from Denmark, from the Danish Peace Society; from France, from the Arbitration Society of which our venerable friend, Frederic Passy, is the President; from Great Britain; from Hungary — the answer is simply that Hungary has no independent treaties; there is no answer from Austria; from Italy; from Norway, from the Norwegian Peace Society, signed by the President of the Lower Chamber of the Norwegian Parliament; from the Netherlands by the Netherlands League of Peace; from Switzerland there is an unsigned answer; from the United States, from the

American Peace Society, Dr. Trueblood signing the document; and from Mrs. Lockwood, who has obtained a letter with replies to the questions from the Department of State at Washington.

Now these answers contain many interesting suggestions, but I must pass over many points which I should like to bring before you, especially somewhat speculative questions as to the state of public opinion.

I have carefully gone through this report, and I propose just briefly to present to you some of the leading points in the answers of the different countries.

Beginning with Germany: Our friends in Germany write in rather a low key. They represent the public opinion in their country as not being very favorable to treaties of arbitration, nor inclined to attach very great value to them. I am sure that this Congress must feel very warm sympathy with the friends of peace in Germany. There is no great country in the world, probably, where there is more difficulty in contending with militarist ideas. But at the same time Germany begins its answer by saying that there is one treaty of obligatory arbitration, and that is, I think, one of the victories that our cause has won during the past year for which we must be thankful. To some of us it has been a most astonishing thing that of all countries Germany should have been induced by our good King, who has proved himself such a peacemaker, to enter into a treaty similar to that between France and England.

Perhaps I may repeat here a remark which I found in the admirable journal of the French Peace Society. It remarked upon a resolution adopted by the German Peace Society couched in somewhat despairing terms, regretting that their country had not entered upon this path of arbitration treaties; almost immediately afterwards this treaty was signed, and the French writer comments that our German friends after all have no need to be discouraged, because when they thought they were making no progress this great step in advance was being made.

One other point in the German answer is that they call attention to the great advantage there would be in a treaty on the same lines with Russia.

From Denmark the answer gives us valuable information as to early Scandinavian treaties of arbitration. It is not well known that the Scandinavian nations between themselves at various times had advocated the principle, and it gives two or three interesting instances. It also refers to a resolution adopted during the past year by the Danish Lower House of Parliament, referring to the draft of a treaty with the United States for the sale of the Danish West Indies to the United States. That treaty passed the Lower House, but it was thrown out by the Senate. There was a resolution adopted recommending that clauses of arbitration referring disputes to the Hague Court should be inserted in all such treaties for the future, and although that particular treaty came to naught, that resolution stands on the records of the Danish House and is a valuable precedent for other countries to note.

Then the report refers with just pride to the treaty between Denmark and the Netherlands, the one absolutely satisfactory arbitration treaty which has been adopted during the year, because it is one which contains no reservations whatever. It is also mentioned that the Congress of the three Scandinavian countries, Norway, Sweden and Denmark, held this year at Copenhagen, urged that treaties of that kind — without any reservation or exception — should be made between those three countries

The answer from France reports the signing of four treaties of obligatory arbitration — those with Great Britain, with Italy, with the Netherlands, and with Sweden and Norway. It speaks of treaties with the United States and with Germany as the two that would be specially valuable to France at the present time. It is noted, also, that whilst at first there appeared to be a disinclination on the part of their government to make use of the Hague Court, that reluctance seems to be overcome, and there is a growing tendency to refer disputes to that great tribunal.

The answer from Great Britain refers to the treaties with France, Italy and Spain. That answer was written before the treaties which have now been adopted with Germany and with Norway and Sweden, so that Great Britain stands party to five treaties of this kind. I believe we hold the record in that respect. I am glad to say that of my own country.

The answer from Italy refers to the treaty with the Argentine Republic. That treaty was the first concluded which adopted without reserve — before the Hague Court, I think, was established — the principle of referring all disputes to arbitration. But unfortunately the Argentine Senate did not agree to the ratification of that treaty. The Italian answer informs us, however, that recently negotiations have been reopened with the Argentine Republic, and it is hoped that before long such a treaty may be concluded. Negotiations, we are informed, are also in progress between Italy and the countries of Peru and Uruguay.

As to the general drift of public sentiment, they tell us that public opinion in Italy is favorable to these treaties, but not enthusiastic; that the qualifications that have been introduced into the treaties have damped the public enthusiasm. Then they refer to their own special difficulty, the feeling of the Italian population which is still under the Austrian Empire, and therefore they feel that the treaty of most value to them would be a treaty with Austria-Hungary. On the last question, that of arbitral clauses in treaties, they are able to give us a list of no less than twenty-one.

The answer from Norway speaks of negotiations on foot with no less than ten different powers. That answer was written before the conclusion of the treaties with France and Great Britain which have now been signed. With regard to arbitral clauses, they say that their country always inserts such clauses in treaties, if the other party consents.

The report from the Netherlands is an abstract from a report presented a year ago, and therefore it has not referred to the treaty with

Denmark. It speaks of the general arbitral clause contained in their treaty of commerce with Portugal made in 1894, which imposes the obligation to refer all disputes between the two countries to arbitration.

Then from Switzerland we are informed that the Federal Council has announced its intention to include arbitral clauses in all treaties although there are no arbitral treaties yet.

So also with the United States: the answer from the United States government at Washington, communicated by Mrs. Lockwood, also has to state that there are no arbitral treaties yet, although it dwells upon the fact that the United States has in many ways shown itself favorable to the principle of arbitration.

I think we owe a great debt to the Berne Bureau and also to the different Peace Societies which have taken the trouble to give these answers.

Now I have to propose, on the part of the Committee, a series of resolutions, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ON TREATIES OF ARBITRATION.

This Congress records its lively satisfaction at the signature of obligatory arbitration treaties since its last session between :

France and Great Britain.
France and Italy.
Great Britain and Italy.
Great Britain and Spain.
Denmark and the Netherlands.
Sweden and Norway and France.
France and Spain.
Spain and Portugal.
Great Britain and Germany.
Sweden and Norway and Great Britain.

The Congress congratulates the governments of these various countries on having thus taken important further steps in the path of juridical relations between nations opened by the Hague Convention, and earnestly expresses the hope that the movement now in progress for the extension of the provision of the Hague Convention in the conclusion of new treaties of obligatory arbitration may speedily be adopted by all the signatories of that historic document, and applied without exception to every case of difficulty which cannot be settled by diplomatic means.

The Congress especially rejoices at the statement recently made by the President of the United States that his government is now "taking steps to secure arbitration treaties with all other governments which are willing to enter into them," and trusts that many such treaties may soon be concluded.

The Congress also especially congratulates the governments of Denmark and the Netherlands on having entered into a treaty of arbitration containing no reserves whatever, and commends this as a model for all future treaties.

The Congress, noting with satisfaction that the different states are more and more introducing arbitration clauses into their various treaties, and especially in treaties of commerce, urges on the governments that, in future, this clause should refer to the Hague Court all conflicts that may arise out of the interpretation of these treaties.

Perhaps I ought, for the sake of those who have not followed this question as closely as some of us, to explain what is the actual bearing of these treaties. At the Hague Conference there was a proposal that for certain subjects, to a certain limited extent, arbitration should be made obligatory upon all the powers which entered into that Convention. When I use that word "obligatory" I want you to note the distinction between the word "obligation" and "compulsion." The word "obligatory" simply means that the powers bind themselves to refer all cases — or certain classes of cases — to arbitration, and it does not mean that compulsion is to be brought to bear upon them by some outside force. This Congress has always declined to sanction that idea.

It was proposed, as I was saying, that to some extent at least the reference to arbitration under the Hague Convention should be obligatory, but it was not found possible to carry that into effect. Some of the powers were willing that there should be set up a court and that there should be a recommendation to powers that they should, in certain cases, refer their disputes to the Court, but they were not willing to bind themselves beforehand to obligatory arbitration. By an article of the treaty it was left open to the powers, if any of them should desire to do so, to go this step further, and to provide by treaty that disputes between them should be referred to arbitration. And so since the Hague Convention was adopted this movement has been initiated for obligatory arbitration treaties, and, as you know, that series of treaties was begun by the one between Great Britain and France, which to us in the United Kingdom was a source of great rejoicing. Our two countries lie so near together. I speak with great feeling on the subject, for it has been my lot to spend a considerable part of my life in France, and I love the French people as truly as I love my own. [Applause.] These two countries in the past have too often been rivals and enemies, and have inflicted upon each other deadly injuries. That these two countries at last have come together is indeed cause for great rejoicing. This treaty of obligatory arbitration was followed by another series of agreements putting an end to a number of disputes which had arisen in the course of time between our two countries. There is every prospect, therefore, as far as human vision can see, that never again shall war break out between France and Great Britain. [Applause.]

Well, I am sure that this Congress will gladly express itself satisfied that these ten treaties have already been concluded, and will go on, as we propose, to express the hope that many more such treaties will soon be made.

Then, as we meet in the United States, you will agree that we cannot but express the wish that this country, which in so many ways has been the mother of this great movement, should very soon make up the ground that it has recently lost, and early bring itself into the van of this fresh movement. We must likewise express our gratification that the President of the United States in receiving the other day the deputation from the Interparliamentary Union told that deputation that his government was taking steps to secure arbitration treaties with all other governments which are willing to enter into them. [Applause.]

As to the treaty between Denmark and the Netherlands, I have already explained how we regard that as the one model treaty, because it is the only one which puts aside all reserve and fear, and the two countries pledge themselves that all disputes shall henceforth go to the arbitration of the Hague Court, and not to the sword. [Applause.]

I need not say much on the last subject, namely, that of arbitration clauses in treaties. There are already a large number of these arbitral clauses; but what we feel should be pointed out is, that now that we have the Hague Tribunal, in all ordinary cases the disputes should be referred to that tribunal. In that way we may add to its power and influence and help to put an end as far as possible to the irregular courts which have heretofore prevailed. That may not be possible entirely. In a treaty like the Postal or the Telegraph Convention it may be more convenient to have a special tribunal. But for all ordinary purposes we shall agree that the principle here proposed is the right one, and that henceforth it ought to be our care to see that a reference to the Hague Court is included in arbitral clauses.

I beg to move the adoption of these resolutions.

M. HENRI LA FONTAINE explained in French the purport of the resolutions offered by Mr. Alexander.

Discussion then followed upon the report.

BARONESS VON SUTTNER: Edward the Peacemaker came to Marienbad this year and our Emperor went there to salute him. The result of the visit was that an arbitration treaty in the same terms as the one signed with France will be made between England and Austria. I thought I could bring the news of the signing of this treaty to this meeting, but it had not been signed when I left, though I believe it will be soon. I want to tell you that the movement inaugurated by Edward the Peacemaker has been taken up by our country, and I wish it to go on the official report of this Congress that our country is not behind other countries.

DR. G. B. CLARK: The United States unfortunately does not appear on the list given by Mr. Alexander; but it should be remembered that the first ruler to propose a treaty of this kind was the President of the United States of America. [Applause.]

My honorable friend, Mr. Cremer, appeared in this country some seventeen years ago with a memorial signed by two hundred and thirty-four members of Parliament. He came afterwards with one signed by over three hundred; and as a result of that and other influences a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States of America was signed by your Secretary of State and by Lord Pauncefote on behalf of our government. Unfortunately your President and Cabinet are not in the position of the governments of Europe, or that treaty would have been in operation now for many years. Unfortunately a treaty requires the sanction of a very large majority of your Senate before it can become law, and unfortunately political questions came in and marred the great movement begun by an American and endorsed by an American President. It was political reasons that defeated the treaty, and not the desire, I believe, of the American people, which was expressed by the President. It will go down in history that this movement was begun by an American President, acceding to the request of my friend, Mr. Cremer, and the memorial he brought over.

Dr. Charles G. Ames: There is one subject which ought to find mention, at least, in our deliberations. It may be already provided for, but as yet I think it has found no mention.

After a conference with some other members I am asked to state the following as an addition to the resolutions. I do not know whether it comes properly at this point or not, but you shall judge.

"In view of the probability of the meeting of an International Conference to continue the work of the recent Conference at The Hague, we submit, as one of the most important subjects for the consideration of that Congress, the fearful and wholesale injustice of permitting nations at war with each other to make the territory of neutral peoples the theatre of military operations. We ask, therefore, in the name of simple justice, for a general rule of international law that shall defend the territory of non-combatant peoples in every part of the world from invasion by belligerent powers."

Dr. Darby: May I, on behalf of Commission A, simply give the Congress the information that the resolution just offered, or the substance of it, was submitted to the Commission, which will report upon it in due course.

The Chairman ruled that Dr. Ames' resolution was not germane to the resolutions under consideration, and must be dealt with as stated by Dr. Darby.

Hayne Davis: I think the fact ought to be recorded that the Olney-Pauncefote Treaty, signed under President Cleveland's administration, was approved by an overwhelming majority of the United States Senate, and that it failed to become operative only because a two-thirds majority was required, and it lacked only four votes of the necessary two-thirds majority. [Applause.] It ought to be recorded also that the present President of the United States has officially announced that this government is even now taking steps to open up negotiations for a treaty of arbitration with every nation in the world.

W. R. Cremer: I regret to say that I find myself differing slightly with one of the resolutions and the proposal which it contains. The point of difference between me and the Committee is in the clause beginning, "The Congress, noting with satisfaction that the different states are more and more introducing arbitration clauses into their various treaties," etc.

Now that brings me to a point upon which I feel somewhat strongly, and which I tried to explain to the Interparliamentary Conference last year in Vienna. I did not press my resolution to a division upon that occasion because I found serious differences of opinion among the members of the Conference in regard to the proposal to ask the nations to establish what I call a court of first instance.

It does seem to me folly to recommend to nations to refer trifling differences of opinion that arise with regard to interpretation of treaties of commerce to the Hague Tribunal. I want to keep that tribunal in reserve, that it may occupy the same position to the world that the Supreme Court of the United States does to the States. I believe it is quite possible that by instituting courts of first instance they can settle all minor cases without referring them to the great tribunal at The Hague.

Let me illustrate. A dispute arises between France and Great Britain of a trifling character, but which may contain seeds of a future strife. It is very much better that the dispute shall be settled at once by arbitration rather than be allowed to grow. I believe that could easily be done by a court of first instance. My idea is this, that England, say, should appoint three arbitrators,— a dispute of a trifling nature and character having arisen upon the interpretation of some treaty or upon some other point,— and France should appoint three arbitrators; that the six should appoint amongst them a chairman, and if they failed to agree on a chairman that they should have the power to appeal to the Hague Court to appoint a chairman for them. This would be very simple and economical.

The idea of setting that great tribunal in motion and paying the necessary expense would be in itself a powerful deterrent, and prevent many of the smaller and poorer states from employing its services. But the proposal which I am suggesting, the establishment of a court of first instance, would remove that difficulty. There would be no difficulty about putting it in motion, no fear of the expense incurred. But if the court of first instance after fully inquiring should fail to accomplish the object in view, namely, settle the dispute in question, then either party should have the power to appeal to the great tribunal at The Hague.

I believe in the majority of instances the court of first instance would settle the differences, because the difference in question would really pertain to themselves, would be rather of a domestic than an international character. Some hesitate to appeal to the great tribunal at The Hague from racial grounds. They say that the men who compose that tribunal do not understand their particular and national interests. And I believe that if such a court of first instance were set up it would facilitate the arbitration of all differences between nations.

I respectfully suggest that the Committee that prepared these resolutions, or some other authority, should turn their attention to the advisability of recommending the establishment of courts of first instance, to keep the great tribunal at The Hague in reserve for questions of greater magnitude and importance. [Applause.]

MR. ALEXANDER: I think we can make a slight modification in this resolution. I have submitted it to Mr. Cremer and he says that with the modification introduced he will not oppose it.

I propose that the word "all" be left out, and that we say: "That in future this clause should refer to the Hague Court conflicts that may arise," etc.

We must all feel that what Mr. Cremer has laid before the Congress is worthy of careful consideration at some future time, but it is impossible now to take up that point. We are very glad to propose this slight modification, which will — to some extent, at all events — meet Mr. Cremer's views.

The Chairman then put the resolutions to vote and they were unanimously adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN : There is another report from Committee B which will be made by Dr. Trueblood.

REMARKS OF BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

Mr. Chairman: The Committee have asked me to report the resolution which they have prepared on the subject of a stated international congress. It is as follows :

> "This Congress heartily endorses the recommendation made by joint resolution of both houses of the Massachusetts legislature in favor of 'an international congress to meet at stated periods to deliberate upon questions of common interest to the nations, and to make recommendations thereon to the governments.'"

It will be remembered that in the early part of the year 1903, on the initiative of the American Peace Society and a considerable number of citizens of Massachusetts, the subject of a regular international congress was submitted to the legislature of Massachusetts. The memorial of Raymond L. Bridgman and others, which had also been submitted the year before, was in favor of a world-legislature; the memorial of the Peace Society asked only for an advisory congress of the nations. The Committee on Federal Relations, after an extended hearing, approved the subject with unanimity so far as we know, and the proposition when reported by the Committee was approved by both Houses of the Legislature without a single voice raised against it. The proposition was sent to the Congress of the United States by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts, and has since that time been in the hands of the Committees on Foreign Relations of both the Senate and the House.

In the meantime, the proposition has been approved by many distinguished business men throughout the country, by a considerable number of public men, by eminent private citizens, by all the justices of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, by many members of the Bar of Philadelphia, by the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, etc.

At the recent Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at St. Louis, held under the auspices and at the expense of our government, this same subject was taken up and the proposition heartily endorsed in the most important resolution voted by the Conference.

This resolution was presented by the Interparliamentary delegates, through their Secretary, Dr. Gobat of Switzerland, to the President of the United States at their recent interview with him. The President received the deputation, consisting of nearly two hundred of the leading statesmen of the world, with great cordiality, and told them that as soon as it was practicable he was ready to call an international conference to consider this as well as the other important subjects contained in the resolution.

That is the position of the subject to-day; and many of us feel that the creation of a congress of the nations, to meet periodically for the discussion of international questions, is the next great step in the movement toward world unity, world harmony and world peace. We do not ask yet for a world-legislature, which may come in time, but only for a congress for discussion and recommendation.

There is not time to discuss the matter here to-day. The project has been approved almost everywhere where it has become understood, and it seems clear that the time has come for the first steps to be taken in this second part of the great movement for the organization of peace among the nations. The Hague Court is already established and doing its work; treaties of obligatory arbitration are being negotiated now so rapidly that even a specialist can hardly keep up with the number. The arbitration movement is coming rapidly to its culmination. The time has certainly come when the movement for a periodic congress of nations already so auspiciously inaugurated should be pushed forward, in order that we may have, as soon as possible, the complement and counterpart of the international court.

The resolution, as it comes from the Committee, seems to me not to be full enough, and I propose, in order to make it what it really should be, to add the following words to it: "and notes with great satisfaction that the proposition has been approved by the recent Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis, and on the recommendation of that Conference is one of the subjects to be put upon the program of the new International Conference which the President of the United States has declared himself ready to call as soon as practicable."

I move the adoption of the resolution with this addition.

HON. WM. J. COOMBS: I certainly approve of the resolution. I had come to the Congress with the idea of recommending that the various nations of the earth send authoritative representatives to a congress for one specific purpose, and that was to codify international law. We find that as far as the interpretation of international law is uniform there is no difficulty in its enforcement; but in the case of many of the laws which are supposed to govern the nations in their relations with one another there is a variety of interpretation. It is possible that the plan suggested by this resolution will result in the accomplishment of that result, and I shall make no amendment.

The necessity of the nations understanding the laws which are supposed to govern their relations with one another is becoming very important. The more we limit the grounds of disagreement the greater we extend the territory of peace. [Applause.] I believe, however, that the representatives to a congress to accomplish that result should be the students of international law throughout the world.

I am glad to have the opportunity to point this out to this intelligent

Congress, and to ask your attention to the consideration of a subject which I believe to be extremely practical and extremely important at the present time.

The resolution as presented by Dr. Trueblood was then adopted unanimously.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now call on Dr. Darby to make a report from Committee A on the Reduction of Armaments.

REMARKS OF DR. W. EVANS DARBY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen; I have the honor to present another installment of the report of Commission A. The question to which this part of our report refers is a very large and important one. I think it is in many respects the most important question which can come before this Congress. It will help us, however, to keep our thoughts closely to one point if I read the resolution which the Committee, after going carefully into the various aspects of the question, proposes for adoption.

> "The Congress thanks the President of the United States for his promise to take the first steps for the convocation of a new International Peace Conference, to resume the deliberations commenced at The Hague in 1899. It expresses the opinion that the first task of such a conference should be to elaborate and apply a definite plan for the simultaneous arrest and the subsequent reduction of the armaments which the Hague Conference declared to be a 'crushing burden and a constant peril to the whole world.'"

The terms of this resolution are so exceedingly simple that they do not require any elaborate explanation. They refer, however, to a state of things of which you on this Continent are ignorant, and perhaps I may therefore be allowed to add a few words in support of the resolution.

You are happily ignorant of the crushing burden and constant peril that are upon the civilized world and the Christendom of to-day, after nineteen hundred years of the preaching of the gospel of goodwill and peace. I am afraid, however, from what we have heard since coming here, and indeed from what had reached us previously, that you are in danger yourselves of getting to know what this crushing burden and this constant menace to peace and prosperity mean.

The Hague Conference, as you are aware, was called for a definite purpose. The object of it, the reason of its existence, is to be found in the words of that celebrated letter of the Emperor of Russia addressed to the various governments which had representatives at his Court. The rulers of Europe had, according to the terms of the letter, been at their wits' end to know how to meet the increasing expenditures of their governments. For a long series of years, a fresh impulse being given to the process by every war that occurred, the nations of Europe have been engaged in what a distinguished English statesman called "the mad race of international rivalry." I will not trouble you with any statistics, nor show how the expense has been increased with every new budget for a series of years. A very simple illustration will convey to you some idea of the situation. A little while before the issuing of that Rescript a discussion had been carried on in the European newspapers, originated by a distinguished French statesman, in which our good English friend, Mr. W. T. Stead, in a powerful article published in the "Contemporary Review," had taken a prominent part. It was during the lifetime of the late Czar of Russia, and it is said that at a meeting in Copenhagen when he was visiting his relatives there, the matter was first discussed with the King of Denmark, who made the public statement that his son-in-law was exceedingly anxious to stop the growth of armaments, and that the Emperor of Austria was in full accord with their desire. But the illustration that I want to use is this: We have, as you all know, a comic newspaper in England which serves a very good purpose indeed. Like the drama, it holds the mirror up, not to nature, but to current events, and if the image produced in the mirror is perhaps sometimes a little exaggerated and distorted, it nevertheless presents pretty faithfully what is going on around. "Punch," at the time of the discussion to which I refer, had a cartoon which made a great impression. It represented two dragoons, German and French, armed from head to foot, riding no two horses, racing towards a precipice, on which was the word "Bankruptcy." At the saddle-bows of these warriors there hung bags of gold, representing the amount of the annual expenditure of these two countries. Well, it was a simple picture, but it represented the actual state of things, not of France and Germany alone, but of all the nations of Europe.

The Hague Conference was called to discuss this question, but when it met it was found impossible to deal with it properly. You cannot get rid of centuries of rivalry and suspicion in a day, and the delegates who came from all parts of the world to form that Conference found that the time had not come even to consider how this "upward march," as it was termed in the Rescript,— how this upward march of expenditure could be stopped. So the Conference proceeded, very wisely indeed, to discuss the questions that it found to be practicable; but before it separated it expressed a very decided opinion with regard to this terrible evil by which the nations were cursed. It declared that the armaments of the civilized world were a crushing burden and constant peril for the whole world, and therefore that the nations ought to study the question with a view to some relief. Then, in the final Act, before separating, the Conference expressed an opinion that further conferences should be called for the discussion of important questions. It is to that part of the final Act of the Hague Conference that our resolution refers.

You have heard already of the promise of your President, given to the deputation of the Interparliamentary Union, to promote arbitration treaties with other nations, but the matter to which the resolution refers is another,— that he would take the first step in calling a new conference to deal with the subjects left unfinished at the Hague Conference of 1899.

You will see that no more appropriate ruler could be chosen than the President of the United States. The Czar of Russia is, unfortunately, by the circumstances of the war in the Far East, prevented from carrying his beneficent intentions and proposals further, and there is no other ruler so free from the complications of European competition as the President of the United States.

Just one word more. The resolution refers to two things that a conference should be called for. The resolution is the expression of the opinion that the first task of the conference should be to elaborate and apply a definite plan for the simultaneous arrest of armaments. That is the first thing, because they are growing still. The Czar issued a terrible indictment of the whole military system, and everybody admits the truth of it. The nations went into that Conference and achieved the wonderful results that came of it. But what have they been doing since? Year by year they have been adding to the burden which had already pressed heavily on the national life, until to-day their normal annual expenditure is, in the case of some of them, double what it was before the holding of that Conference. The first thing is to stop the mounting upwards of these enormous expenses. [Applause.] The next thing, of course, is to lessen these burdens so that the peoples of Europe, the working classes especially, may be able to live their lives and to do their work in comfort at any rate — which is not the case to-day.

Therefore, our committee asks you, and I hope it will be done not only with unanimity but with enthusiasm, to adopt the resolution which has been presented. [Applause.]

Rev. Charles F. Dole: May I, after conference with some members of the Congress, present as pertinent to this resolution and adding to it the following:

> "Inasmuch as Secretary Hay, the highest living authority upon the Monroe Doctrine, has coupled the mention of this doctrine with the Golden Rule, and inasmuch as no European power appears to have designs against any American nation, the Congress expresses the opinion that no necessity exists for the people of the United States to entertain suspicion towards their neighbors, — the peoples of Europe, — or to maintain an increased naval establishment with reference to any just or reasonable interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Congress that it is almost impossible to do anything with the main resolution as long as the United States with its immense advantages in favor of maintaining the peace of the world goes on spending a hundred millions of dollars a year in maintaining and increasing its naval establishment. [Applause.] What can the United States say to any other nation while it is setting an example by an increase of its force?

Now there is a vague suspicion — it is vague, but the vague suspicions do the most harm — that the reason for this great increase is to support the Monroe Doctrine. You will never bring about the peace of the world by merely external means and by votes, so long as the nations of the world are looking at each other with suspicion, even while they are reducing their armaments, if you please. You have absolutely got to reduce suspicion, and to have the nations look at each other through the eyes of trust and affection.

Now the object of this resolution is simply for the people here. We are surely far enough advanced in regard to our thoughts of the Monroe Doctrine to assure the people of America that there is no need of maintaining any vague suspicions of the peoples over the water.

It is perfectly clear that this resolution could not be proposed anywhere except in America, and it could not be brought up except by an American. Yet I cannot believe that any delegate from abroad can have any objection to it, and surely I cannot see that any American can have any objection to saying this much towards removing the attitude of suspicion which exists there.

JOHN I. GILBERT: I move that the motion be laid upon the table; not because I antagonize the ideas. I am not prepared to discuss the subject now. I do not think this Convention is prepared to consider it now, or has time for the consideration of it. And I do not think it is quite the place in this World's Congress to introduce matters that can be introduced only by an American.

HENRY B. CARRINGTON: I take great pleasure, as an American, in seconding the motion to lay Mr. Dole's resolution upon the table. It seems to me to be entirely out of place. While our government is doing its utmost to bring peace into the world, we should not criticise the present condition of its naval armament, which has enabled it, without trespassing upon any body, to bring to the extreme East and all nations of the world an opportunity to agree upon peace.

THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Gilbert has moved that the additional resolution offered by Mr. Dole be laid upon the table. A motion to lay upon the table is not debatable. The question will now be taken upon laying upon the table Mr. Dole's resolution.

The motion was carried and Mr. Dole's resolution was laid upon the table.

PROFESSOR QUIDDE (interpreted by Dr. Trueblood): Professor Quidde objects to the statement in the resolution that the first task of such a Conference should be to elaborate and apply a plan for arrest and reduction of armaments. He thinks that the matter of the extension of the scope and work of the Hague Court through a general treaty of obligatory arbitration is at least as important as the other. I propose that we satisfy Professor Quidde by changing the wording to "one of the chief duties of such a conference would be to elaborate," etc.

HON. WM. P. BYLES: I am not going to make a speech, though I wanted very much to say something upon this subject. It is a subject in which I have been deeply interested for ten or fifteen years. Now we have no time for further discussion, and I am bound to enter a mild word of protest that the time of this Congress has been occupied nearly to the end of the second session with so little business. So many complimentary speeches have been made, so many unnecessary translations, that immediately when we get to an interesting subject we are told that there is no time for debate.

However, I will just content myself by saying that as a delegate to the Conference who has traveled a good many thousand miles to be here, I support entirely the motion made by the Committee on this subject. There are far more reasons for it than were educed even in the detailed speech of my friend Dr. Darby, reasons which I should like very much to suggest to the Conference, and I hope at some other time I may be able to do so. I earnestly support the resolution offered, and I thought there ought to be some support at any rate from outside the official Commission. [Applause.]

DR. TRUEBLOOD: May I say, in response to the remarks of Mr. Byles, that it is the wish of the management of the Congress to conduct everything with the utmost fairness to all, and at the same time to avoid as far as possible everything that is superfluous. The speeches of greeting have been made as few and as brief as possible under the circumstances, and the demand for the translations is so large that they cannot in justice be suppressed.

ALFRED H. LOVE: I move to add to the words "subsequent reduction" the words "and eventual abolition." We do not want to temporize; we want to have something definite.

DR. G. B. CLARK: I am very much obliged to the Committee for adopting in substance the resolution which I sent in some two or three weeks ago, but I think that there are one or two points where slight changes might well be made. The first would be the insertion of the word "gratefully" — "gratefully thanks." I think we ought to be grateful to the President for the course he has taken. [Applause.] The other is to make clear what we want. The form the Committee have adopted is not sufficiently clear. After the word "arrest" we ought to use these phrases: "of naval armaments, and a simultaneous and proportionate reduction of military armaments." As a matter of fact even in America you have reduced your military armaments. Almost everywhere military armaments are not increasing, but you have a terrible increase of naval armaments. Italy alone is reducing her naval armaments. The fact is, it is impossible in Europe to increase military armaments because in nearly every country of Europe every man is obliged to serve, and the only way to increase the number would be to bring in the women and enroll them.

Now the two countries which, I am sorry to say, are leading in the mad race of naval increase, are my own country and the United States to a certain extent also. We in Great Britain have appealed to chancellors like Lord Goshen and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and they have said that if some of the other great nations will agree to reduce their naval armaments Great Britain will reduce also. Ten years ago we were spending two hundred million dollars a year on our navy; now it is four hundred million dollars a year. At this Conference which is to be called by your President, we wish to announce that we desire that the naval armaments may be arrested. I think our government is prepared to consider it, because our revenue has ceased to be elastic.

Then the question of simultaneous and proportionate reduction of military armaments must be considered. The Court at The Hague now being in operation, and every civilized power having agreed to appeal to reason instead of force, there is no need for these great armaments. When you are appealing to reason and justice, they are unnecessary.

MR. HOUZEAU DE LEHAIE, a member of the Committee, explained the resolution in French, and suggested that the wording of the last part be "the simultaneous arrest and subsequent reduction of the military and naval armaments," etc.

DR. DARBY: I should like to point out that as a simple matter of fact the military expenditure of Great Britain has doubled during the last five years, quite as much as the naval. I am quite sure Dr. Clark will accept the suggestion of the chairman. I think it is desirable that naval expenditure should be definitely expressed as Dr. Clark proposes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question will come up first on Mr. Love's amendment.

MR. ALEXANDER: Will you allow me a word against that amendment. I believe in the principle of it, yet I cannot but feel that if we put those words into our resolution we shall at the present time destroy its efficiency. The multitude around us will think it Utopian, and we shall thereby greatly weaken the force of our action.

HON. JOHN BRYN ROBERTS: I want to make an appeal to the Conference not to move amendments of trifling moment; not to ask for changes unless they are of a fundamental character. We ought to leave all these trifling matters to the Committee and confine ourselves to amendments of a fundamental character.

MR. SMILEY: I think the passage of Mr. Love's amendment would do great harm to our Conference, and I move that it be laid upon the table.

Judge Gilbert seconded this motion, and Mr. Love's amendment was laid upon the table, the motion being unanimously carried.

DR. CHIRURG: Dr. Darby has made a report on the reduction of armaments and has also given his able explanations as to the history of the Hague Tribunal. He is the first Englishman among those who have spoken that has mentioned the Russian Czar as the man who called that tribunal into existence. I fear that the passing of this resolution will embarrass our President. We are here a body of men for the purpose of peace and not for the purpose of strife. My English colleagues here seem always to be wishing to put force upon our President, to get him to take the first step. I wish, in the name of peace and love, that when they go home they would influence the men in power there. That is the place to begin. The people of England are for peace, but the men in power there are the cause of the war in the East. Let them withdraw from their treaty with Japan, and we shall then have peace in the East, and then we can get some reduction of armaments. [Applause.]

The resolution, with the proposed modifications suggested by Dr. Clark and Mr. Houzeau de Lehaie, was then read again, as follows:

> "The Congress gratefully thanks the President of the United States for his promise to take the first steps towards the convocation of a new International Peace Conference to resume the deliberations commenced at The Hague in 1899. It expresses the opinion that one of the chief duties of such a conference should be to elaborate and apply a definite plan for the arrest and the subsequent simultaneous and proportionate reduction of the military and naval armaments which the Hague Conference declared to be a 'crushing burden and constant peril to the whole world.' "

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

On motion of Mr. Edwin D. Mead it was voted that, on account of the great amount of business before the Congress, a session should be held on Saturday morning.

The Secretary announced various messages of greeting to the Congress which he had received, and read a letter from Mr. Andrew Carnegie. These appear with the other messages at the end of the report of the first session.

On motion of Dr. Clark, duly seconded, Mr. Carnegie's letter was sent to the Committee on Current Events to take such action as they should think necessary.

The meeting then adjourned.

On Thursday afternoon at 2 o'clock Hon. John L. Bates, Governor of Massachusetts, received the delegates at the State House. The reception was attended by a large number of the delegates and their friends, and the Governor's welcome was most cordial and sympathetic.

After the Governor's reception a considerable number of the delegates went on an excursion to Concord.

Public Meeting in Tremont Temple.

Thursday Evening, October 6, 1904.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATORS IN CREATING RIGHT IDEALS OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE.

Edwin D. Mead called the meeting to order at 8 o'clock and introduced Prof. Francis G. Peabody of Harvard University as the presiding officer of the evening. PROFESSOR PEABODY thereupon took the chair and said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: The subject of our Conference this evening is "The Responsibility of Educators in creating Right Ideals of International Life," and I am to have the pleasure of presenting to you several speakers of various nationalities who will enter into the details of this intensely interesting question.

Allow me to detain you for a moment with a word concerning the subject in its most general form. There are certainly many aspects of our contemporary life which give to the praise of peace to-day a touch of irony. On the same page of the paper on which are reported the proceedings of one session of this gathering one may read the report of new slaughter in the East and of new battleships at home. And yet, in the face of these apparent obstacles, we maintain an ineradicable faith that the world is moving toward peace.

What possible ground have we for this inextinguishable faith? Partly our sentiment of fraternity and compassion. Yet it is not merely a sentiment which is so persistent and so commanding. Partly the horror of war. Yet the modern man does not fear to fight or to sacrifice for a worthy cause. Partly the amazing effect of a gathering like this or of the Hague Tribunal. Yet it is impossible to weigh these demonstrations as against the weight of the incidents of warfare without a shade of disappointment. The grounds of our faith are not purely sentimental, nor incidental nor contemporary, but they are essentially reasonable and lie in the emergence of a new aspect of truth, which it is for educators to enforce and for the educated, first of all, to recognize.

This new aspect of truth which now compels the allegiance of all educated people is of course the sense of unity, of interdependence, of correlation which binds together equally the forces of nature and the destinies of nations. Here is a truth which was first disclosed to men of science in the doctrine of the correlation and the unity of physical force. It was taken over into philosophy in the doctrine of the social organization, the one body with its many members. It was recognized in relation as the East and the West began to touch one another, and we became aware as the world never knew before that God had made of one blood all the nations of the earth. And, finally, the statesmen and the politicians discerned, when they were acute enough, that the welfare of one man demanded the welfare of all; that international peace was the foundation of intranational welfare; that the world, in short, was one world, with its interests not divided but in common.

This is a truth disclosed to the educated, a truth of academic learning. But more or less imperfectly this great truth of modern education is beginning to enter like an instinct into the habits of mind of the present day, and to a person thus educated in the sense of the unity of the world, what anachronism could be so monstrous as the thought of a divided, fighting, warring world! [Applause.] To the scientific mind such a thought of a divided world is simply unthinkable. To the philosophical mind it is a sheer survival. To the historical mind it is a perversion of human history. And to the religious mind it is simply an insult to the unity of God. [Applause]

In other words, it is not necessary that education should primarily concern itself with the subject we have in hand; for, whether it will or not, the very processes of education through their own development and expansion make irresistible the way we want the world to go. [Applause.] It is one of the most curious facts of modern life that many of the causes which have been much urged in many ways have been suddenly in our time reinforced by the new conditions of the world. Take the case of temperance, for instance, which has been prayed about and preached about and yet has seemed to move with unjustifiable slowness. In our time, from a wholly unexpected quarter, there has come a help to the cause of temperance — and whence? From the conditions of modern industry. The very age of the machine has brought with it a new demand for accuracy, sagacity, persistency, sureness of touch and sureness of eye, and these demand thoroughness. And so thousands of factories and railways demand abstinence in the name of industry. And it is altogether probable that the most important contribution to the cause of temperance to-day is made — all unconscious of its significance — by the new order of the industrial world. Precisely in the same way the work of education contributes, often unconsciously, yet irresistibly, to the cause of peace; and underneath the movements which we try to advance lies the inevitable advance of the sense of the unity of the world. We give ourselves, therefore, to these underlying currents, which we do not create but to which it is our wisdom to conform. The eddies of the tide may seem to make the other way, but the deeper channels of the thought of the age are moving irresistibly toward the unity of the world.

You remember how, year after year, the Arctic explorers started up the Greenland coast to reach the pole, day after day tramped over the moving ice, and then at the day's close found that they had been opposed by a great underlying current that had swept them and the pack of ice beneath them backward, southward, until at the day's close they were farther south than when the day began. And then, as you remember, Nansen tried the other way of approach,—from the Siberian end,—and gave himself and his ship to the great polar current, and though it seemed to hem him in, it bore him on through weary days and months until at last he was farther North than he had ever hoped to be. That is the kind of underlying movement of intellectual life of the age to which a movement like this entrusts itself, and though we are shut in and shut out and seem bewildered and baffled by the circumstances of the time, the polar current of the movement of thought may carry us farther than ever to-night we dare to dream. [Applause.]

I have the pleasure now of presenting to you, as the first speaker, Mr. G. H. Perris of England, the editor of "Concord," who will now address us.

ADDRESS OF G. H. PERRIS.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The title which is given to us upon the printed sheet is "The Responsiblities of Educators in regard to Peace and War," but I should like at the outset to suggest to you that these responsibilities are not—as many responsibilities are—of an onerous, or at least of a painful, character. I cannot help saying this at the outset, because to me it is always one of the delights of the year to come to the International Peace Congress. I meet there men from every clime, men born in circumstances as different from my own as it is possible to imagine, men who, if they had not been liberated from the traditions and prejudices in which they were born, would have believed themselves to be my enemies, the enemies of my country; but men who by the exercise of some reason, perhaps also stimulated to some extent by the incidents of their life, have come to see that as a matter of fact men are brothers. It is one of the great pleasures of the year to meet the peace workers who have given years of their life with utter unselfishness, under difficulties which in this happy New World you do not know, in going about the old countries of Europe preaching peace. To me these are heroes of a warfare more sacred than any other warfare which has ever been pursued on earth. And I beseech you young men and young women whom I see in this hall to-night to join us and taste the pleasure which comes to those who have become international men.

Now I suppose that nobody ever really defends war outright. Nobody in his senses stands up and says that he would desire fighting. It is perfectly true that some misguided persons, when they find fighting going on, or when they have some other reason for wishing for an object which is to be obtained through fighting, discover excuses, presumed justifications for provoking warfare. But no one in his right mind follows this course. No one can really believe that war is a school of bravery, of courage, of chivalry, to such an extent as to think that we should deliberately enter it for that purpose. Therefore we have to ask ourselves why it is that so many people do excuse existing warfare and prospective warfare; why it is so many are given to discovering virtues in the horrible scenes which we have continually reflected in our newspapers at the present day. And if we do so, we shall find that in the main this attempt at justification and excuse, and even glorification, is due to ignorance of the real facts of warfare, or to the apathy of the persons to whom those pleas are addressed, or to the survival of ideas which have really lost all their vital force in society as we have it to-day.

There was a time when warfare contained moral qualities. I, to-day, like to read Fenimore Cooper. I read an account a few days ago of an incident in Manchuria — I will try to recite it to you. In the dawn of the morning a Russian detachment was sent out to capture a Japanese trench. They killed the whole of the Japanese body in this trench and took it. The whole scene was covered with fog; they saw neither their own friends nor their enemies; they were drowned in fog. After they had been there in the cold dawn under this mist for an hour or two, there began dropping upon them, at first by accident, and then gradually into a well directed leaden shower, the shells of the Japanese, who had found the range of the trench. This went on for several hours, and at last the trench became untenable. One by one the remnant of the Russian soldiers, still invisible to others, still not seeing either their friends or their foes, deserted the trench, and a feeble remnant pursued their dangerous way down the hillside and managed to regain their comrades. Now I cannot give you the impression which the details of this made upon my mind. What I felt was that it was a complete automatic process out of which the whole of the human element had died. They did not know what they were doing; they were in the dark the whole time; nothing appeared to them but this shower of leaden shells extinguishing so many precious lives.

The fact is, of course, that under the pressure of modern invention warfare has fundamentally changed its character. As the great Russian sociologist, Jean de Bloch, has proved to a demonstration, it has become a process of wholesale manslaughter by machinery. All those elements which tended to the uplifting of the soul have gone out of warfare; it has become indeed, as one of your great generals said, "Hell."

Now, therefore, the men who attempt to justify warfare by an appeal to the old incidents of history, the heroic wars of the past, the wars for liberty, the wars for great ideas, are ignoring this fundamental change in society, due mainly to invention. They are ignoring the facts of evolution, and they are proving themselves to be as little scientific as they are human. I maintain, therefore, that we of the peace movement are not simply humanitarians, we are the true scientists. Warfare is not simply brutal, but it is also in its processes utterly out of harmony with our modern life, with the tendencies of our time.

I venture, especially, to say to you who are engaged directly in the work of education that it is the duty of every reasonable and sober person on every occasion, in the school room, on the railway, in the street, in the business office, in the home, to tackle that insane, that most rudimentary and ridiculous idea that war is to be regarded as a species of sublime sport to be engaged in by specialists, to be watched, to be discussed simply upon its strategic and its tactical side, without any regard to its terrible effects, its degrading influences upon both the participants and the spectators.

Perhaps the greatest enemy that the ideas of peace have to encounter, and that, therefore, the educators of the world have to deal with, is the apathy of the populace who are enjoying the condition of peace and who, through lack of imagination, do not realize the horrors of warfare, and above all do not realize the responsibilities which attach to them.

This meeting is addressed specifically to educators; but every country which is self-governing should be an educator to every country which is not self-governing; every country which is enjoying freedom should be a lighthouse for the world; a country enjoying the prosperity of the United States has a responsibility far above that of those countries of the Old World which are oppressed, which are deliberately kept in ignorance, where congresses of this kind are never held. There are still several countries of that character. There is no peace society in the Empire of Russia; not because there are no friends of peace in the Empire of Russia, — there are probably more friends of peace there than in any other country in the world. [Applause.]

I think that these international Peace Congresses have had this important effect, that they have taught the members of the congresses to deal plainly with their own governments upon questions of peace and war. I will not attempt to give you suggestions upon this point, but I will say that in every nation there is a natural hesitation to apply to one's own country the precepts which would be applied to other countries. We hesitate too often to apply at home the lessons which we are only too ready to preach abroad. But in this respect the friends of peace have made some advance. In the last few years we have had to meet a good many difficulties. During that horrible war in South Africa the friends of peace in England stood up bravely in public, in buildings and out of buildings, at a great deal of cost and inconvenience to themselves, and told the plain truth about it. Plain truth-telling is the first requisite in the education of the world towards peace. The man is no patriot who will not dare to tell his own fellow-citizens and his own government that which he knows to be the truth. [Applause.] When we are prepared to tell our own people what in the silence of our hearts we know to be the truth, we shall have taken the first step towards removing the apathy which is the great obstacle to organized peace throughout the world.

And, then, we must make an educational propaganda in the schools.

The false idea of patriotism is already well corrected in those who are used to hearing such words as we have heard from our presiding officer to-night. But the great mass of the people who live far removed from universities, who get little of the higher ranges of education, still need to be told how ancient, how false is the old idea of patriotism, still need to be taught that the best type of patriot is the one who is also, as I have said, the international man, the man who realizes that national patriotism is but a stage toward a larger patriotism, in exactly the same way that your Boston patriotism is a constituent of your national patriotism. There is a large work to do in this respect in the schools of our various countries in training the children in right ideas.

In conclusion let me say that there remains a whole range of educative work to be done in regard to the character of industry, of commerce, and of all those contributory processes which bind the nations together.

If our children were taught what is the true nature of commerce alone, they would begin to feel instinctively that there is something ridiculous in the attempt to teach them that the foreigner is an enemy. The foreigner is the man who buys your goods; the foreigner is the man who is working to provide you with something that you want. In fact, the commerce of the world, the art of the world, the science and thought of the world are building up, slowly but surely, the federation of man which the poets and the apostles have sung. And all that we of the peace party can hope to do is to expedite this movement by making people conscious that it is a law of nature and society that force shall get out of the world to make room for increasing coöperation, that all the processes of civilization are processes of coöperative life, and that this process is destiny itself.

The Chairman: I have the very great pleasure of presenting to you next a speaker whom some of you have already come to know and to appreciate, and to whom I wish to give our united greeting in the bonds of international peace. I present to you the Baroness von Suttner of Austria.

ADDRESS OF THE BARONESS VON SUTTNER.

Mr. President: I suppose you have called me to speak a few words on the ground that generally women are the true educators of men. [Applause.] Well, you applaud, but I was of a different opinion. I think that the women, if they are to educate the next generation for peace, must be educated themselves. [Applause.] We must try to educate them to that great task, for as women generally go, I am sure there are among them, just as among men, those who will try to make good soldiers and good patriots in the old sense of the word. They are more conservative than men; certainly they hate and detest war, but they believe that it must remain, and as they have that great error, and as they will try to instigate warlike instincts in their sons,— and those women are the majority, I am sorry to say,— they must be educated. We do not say to our sisters, "Go and speak to your sons of the glory you feel that there is in war." We say, "Learn to know that war is unnecessary, and that you can nobly educate your sons against war; and when you have learned that, then only will you be good teachers."

I have felt that among the happy features of this Congress one of the best is that a special meeting has been introduced for the education of such. There are many other happy features about our Congress in this land of the thousand possibilities, as it is called, and which I would even call a land of vanquished impossibilities. [Applause.] The Secretary of State greeting the Congress of Peace and proclaiming the Golden Rule as the foundation of state life, — that is a thing altogether new, and never heard of in any other country. But the most impossible thing of all I have experienced to-day. A greeting came, a telegram that was read to us by the President in the usual words. I listened and when I heard the signature of this telegram I was quite astonished. Well, this telegram was signed, "The Twenty-Third Regiment of Infantry of Massachusetts." [Applause.] Only think! the Twenty-Third Regiment; there is no reason why the Twenty-Fourth Regiment should not be of the same opinion. [Laughter.] I think that is a very happy thing. On the day when the soldiers turn to educating the people in the way of peace, then we shall have won our cause. [Applause.]

Mr. Perris was speaking of Bloch; that was why I was thinking of the possibility of a military peace movement. Bloch addressed his teaching to prominent soldiers; he wanted to educate them to have the courage to investigate the situation; and he taught them to go on and honestly to investigate and to tell the world that war as waged in the past is impossible in the future, and that we must desist from further war and introduce another system for the solution of quarrels.

The educators who are here have learned by experience that the first and the second lesson do not suffice. The officers who heard Bloch did not heed his teaching, but they told their peoples that war is and must remain the only means of settling international questions.

I remember another educator; he was one who educated mankind by art, by painting. It is not only by words and history and science that mankind is educated; it is also by art. The painter I mean was Verestchagin. [Applause.] I knew him very well; he was a friend of mine. When he came to Vienna where he made his exposition of the Napoleon pictures, he related to me how he had seen all the scenes he painted and what impression the pictures made on the people, and not only on the people. When he showed his pictures to the Emperor of Germany, William the Second, the Emperor said to him, "My dear Verestchagin, your pictures preach peace better than the peace societies." He went to the places where those things could be seen, because he wanted to paint them accurately. War pictures that had been previously painted were an encouragement to war.

There was always a general on his white horse going into a burning village, and a few young men lying about dying, with a smile upon their faces, and repeating the Latin words: "It is sweet and glorious to die for one's country." Those pictures were on the walls of all the princes' apartments, but the pictures of Verestchagin have not entered there, and officers are not permitted to go and look at them. Verestchagin was an apostle of peace, and he has died as a martyr of peace. He wanted once more to face his enemy, to let him say what he would do in the next war, and to be able to show that to his contemporaries. But this time war would not permit that one should look at his unmasked face; it had become too terrible. And not wishing that Verestchagin should paint its new horrors, it killed him. The ship that bore him, while he held in his hand his sketch book, was blown into the air and went down with six hundred of the crew, and Verestchagin died a martyr to his cause.

I called it a happy feature that education should be made one of the subjects of this Congress, and I called it happy because it is a token that the movement is already very advanced. For one wishes to teach only that which one believes and which is founded on fact and on science. A fact which is not yet proved, which is only wished and which is in contradiction with every law, cannot be taught, it can be aimed at, but those who do it are revolutionists. We can't teach our children to make revolutions, we can only teach them to expand that which is already a fact and a possibility and which is already a well-grounded principle of science. That the peace movement has come to this point is proved by the fact that you educators are ready to take in hand our movement.

It would be very difficult in a country where there is no freedom, even now that the peace movement exists, to teach the children about it, because schools are under official supervision, and it would be quite impossible to teach anything which is in contradiction to the laws of the country. And the law is in our country that every man shall be drilled to kill the men of a people with whom we may be at war.

But though it is difficult in our European countries, I must say that it has been tried, and we have peace-loving teachers' societies in France even. Our great friend Frederic Passy and his co-workers have had a course of lectures on peace in the Sorbonne, and societies for the education of women exist in France, and societies for peace exist in Germany. But they can't expand in the way in which they can here. When here men who are interested in the peace movement, and who are at the same time educators, take in hand to teach the children the facts of the peace movement, and the great truth of it, then a most necessary and important work will have been accomplished. And such I trust will be the case. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I have the honor of presenting to you as the next speaker Prof. Theodore Ruyssen of France.

ADDRESS OF PROF. THEODORE RUYSSEN.

Professor Ruyssen spoke in French, and his address was interpreted by Mr. Alexander as follows:

Professor Ruyssen spoke of the progress of pacific education in France of late years. He reminded us that in order to understand the history of France in recent times it was necessary to go back to the events of 1870–1, to what they call in France "the terrible year." The generation which succeeded that year, in which France lost so many of her sons and two noble provinces, had been trained in warlike beliefs, and it was not unnatural that they taught the generation of school children the idea that they must look forward to a war of revenge and some opportunity that would enable them to recover those lost provinces and this lost prestige. And so for many years that idea was put before the children in the schools of France. Happily, time has done its work on both sides of the frontier, and especially in France there has been a notable reaction in favor of pacific education. Prizes have been offered for historical books written in a spirit of peace, and great efforts have been made to exclude from schools those pictures which dwell on war and praise war and inculcate the idea of revenge.

At the Nîmes Congress of the peace associations of France held a few months ago there was a large attendance of teachers from different parts of the country, and just as an instance he cited a remark made by one of these teachers. One of them told how in his class he had given a lesson on the Russo-Japanese War, and had pointed out that it was carried on on neutral territory, and how he had asked for the opinion of his pupils about this war of revenge.

Then, again, the peace societies of France are teaching by the eye. They have prepared a series of stereopticon slides, and by the help of a society among the teachers of France they have made arrangements for six hundred lectures to be given this winter.

The success of this movement among the teachers may in a measure be judged by the opposition it has aroused. There has been formed a patriotic league of teachers in opposition to those who are peacefully inclined. A teacher in Paris became alarmed at the thought that the children of France would lose this idea of the revenge that is to come some day, and he therefore founded this so-called patriotic league. It happened that two months afterwards this teacher, who was a very respected teacher, and who had been a member of the general council of the great teachers' association in France, when the election took place for the renewal of that office, was thrown out by a very large majority, and a pacific teacher was put in his place. [Applause.]

Those who are engaged in this propaganda are shamefully abused by what is known as the Nationalist press in France. They are called traitors, enemies of their country, suborned by England or by Germany. And they regard this abuse as the measure of the great success which they are obtaining.

And then Professor Ruyssen closed by saying that one of the objections made against them is that they are weakening the spirit of the children of their country, training a generation which will not grow up with the strong ideals of the past. Their reply is that it is more patriotic by far to raise the minds and the intelligence of the country, and to direct the thoughts of the children to peaceful pursuits, than to direct their thoughts towards war and brute revenge.

Then they are told: "You are alone in this teaching. In other countries people are continuing to teach the children that they must fight for their country, and by and by France will be isolated; it will be the only country that has these peaceful ideas, and all the military countries around it will come down upon it."

As to that, Professor Ruyssen appeals to this Congress that he and his fellow-countrymen can go back and assure the people of France that they are not alone, but that in Germany and England and in the United States also teachers are doing what the teachers are doing in France; that they are instilling into the minds of the children a hatred of war and a love for peace. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: In the mischievous war now proceeding in the Far East it is most dramatic to remember that neither party, as has been said, is fighting upon its own territory, but that both are contending for some share of what still remains a neutral kingdom, the vast kingdom of China.

I have the honor of presenting to you Dr. Yamei Kin of China, to whom we shall listen with the utmost consideration in whatever way she sees fit to address us.

REMARKS OF DR. YAMEI KIN.

The various arguments and all the sentiments that I have heard expressed throughout these meetings come home to me with such a familiar ring, — that peace is the foundation of all good; that from an economical point of view it is to be desired; that we cannot get the best good out of the people unless they are at peace. It all comes home to me, as I have said, with such a familiar ring. For that is what has been instilled into us Chinese for many and many a generation. But as every truth going through each people takes on a little different angle, being reflected in a little different way, so perhaps it may interest you to analyze what in our language is our word "Peace."

One of the Chinese words that is used most commonly in contradistinction to war is a word composed of two syllables. Our language, you know, is one which appeals to the eye as well as to the ear, and every word of our language is composed of signs which carry with them a certain pictorial significance as well as the significance of sound. The word which stands for "Peace" in contra-distinction to "War" is composed of two syllables. It is the roof of the house, the eaves of a house and a dwelling underneath the eaves. The symbol for woman and the word peace in our language is that of home, mother, the family. [Applause.]

Now this will give you one of the ways in which we Orientals have learned how to hold fast to the human, to the mind, to that reflectual something which you in your philosophy have termed the "human being," and yet which is composed of such a bundle of contradictions that indeed your Apostle has said: "That which I would, I do not, and that which I would not, that I do." So the manner in which we have composed this word shows you one of the ways in which it was felt that it was well to hold on to this human element, that this human being may through the power of the emotions raise itself up to the height which we ourselves know, which our intellect tells us is right.

And so, holding fast to the integral meaning of this word,— home, mother, the family,— remember that we have lifted this word "Peace" up to the height of the emotions.

Now probably to the very intellectual people of the United States, to this honorable Boston audience, I may seem quite beside the mark when I tell you that emotion is one of the great means by which we can control the human heart. [Applause.] It is the emotions that govern us, and it is through the emotions, friends, that the great things of this world are done. We need the intellect to guide us, to keep us from going astray; but the great motive power of this world is emotion — you call it love. [Applause.]

So taking hold of this great motive power, symbolized in the concrete form of home, of all that is dearest, and extending the idea to a wider and wider circle until the whole human family is taken in, we may bring the whole world to peace. The duty lies upon every human soul, the responsibility to inculcate this, to spread it abroad, not to the children alone, but to all that are about us.

For what is there that we can teach so great as love, what is there that will teach us as does love — the love of humanity, which after all is only the expression of the love of the great Infinity, for that great love which shall swallow us up, welding us into one great perfection at the end of all things. [Applause.]

The Chairman: The Apostle of the Simple Life is no stranger here. We have all read what he has written for our admonition, our rebuke and our inspiration. I have the honor of presenting to you Pastor Wagner of Paris.

ADDRESS OF PASTOR CHARLES WAGNER.

Pastor Wagner spoke in French and was interpreted by Mr. Alexander as follows:

Pastor Wagner says he has been asked to speak in French probably because people think he is in danger of forgetting his native tongue. He assures us that there is no danger of that happening. He tells us that he has made two voyages, one across the Atlantic and one through the intricacies of English grammar. [Laughter.] He takes up the closing remarks of Professor Ruyssen that we need good neighbors near us, that we need that others should be teaching peace as well as ourselves.

The French have long been considered as very troublesome neighbors; they are those wicked, troublesome rabbits beside whom no one can live and who must be exterminated. They used to sing warlike songs, but that is all changed since they have become a Republic, since everybody in France has to become a soldier. Everything is changed now, everybody must learn war. But no one wants to go and conquer foreign lands. They have learned that Pasteur is better than Napoleon.

Pastor Wagner is himself an Alsatian, and as an Alsatian he would invite their German neighbors to teach the same things. Every time he goes to Germany he repeats the same things to his German friends; he believes that in education you have to do as you do with nails,—you have to strike and strike and strike again.

He is very grieved that his dear, beautiful country of Alsace, which ought to be a bond, a means of union between France and Germany, should, on the contrary, have become an apple of discord between them, and that because of this difficulty over Alsace the world is suffering from the horrors of the armed peace which now exists.

But he believes that there are means of repairing this great evil, and that Alsace can become the bond of union. He does not see why both languages should not be allowed to be spoken in Alsace.

He was within himself two persons; his grandfather was a German, his father was a Frenchman, and he feels that both nationalities reside within himself, and that these two individuals manage to get on beautifully together. [Laughter and applause.]

He thinks that if only some such arrangement as that were made, by which Alsace could be made free to both nationalities, then they would be the means of bringing the two great countries between which Alsace lies to march together for the good of humanity.

In visiting Germany last year he met with men of great learning and scientific attainments, but utterly ignorant of the state of opinion in France and what was going on in France. And he thinks that if only Germans and Frenchmen mingled in Alsace this ignorance would be dispelled, and thus in the midst of Europe there would be a place for fraternization, a centre of concord and harmony. [Applause.]

The Chairman next introduced Rev. Walter Walsh of Dundee, Scotland.

REMARKS OF REV. WALTER WALSH.

Mr. Chairman: I am a citizen of a country which used to claim a proud preëminence in education. I am happy to say that that preëminence is passing away because the other nations are coming up.

I am happy to be in a city where I know educators in schools live, and where temperance and kindness to animals are taught in the schools.

War is the great stupidity — the great stupidity of the world. [Applause.] And as the school is the army which marches forth against the hosts of ignorance, we want all the teachers to enter the lists against the hosts of ignorance in regard to war.

We know how in Great Britain the whole machinery of the schoolhouse has been prostituted to the degradation of the minds and spirits of the children of the country in regard to this subject, and because we know this we can speak of the immense, the unparalleled importance of teaching the young minds the arts of Christianity and of good citizenship and of peace.

We want our children shown that war is the great inhumanity — inhuman to the very animals concerned, not to speak of the men. Hundreds and thousands of horses are cruelly done to death in war, lingering in long agonies on the battlefield before death comes to their relief. We ought to teach our children to have pity upon the dumb and suffering innocent creatures. [Applause.]

We want our children taught the economic waste and foolishness and positive silliness of war. [Applause.] We want them taught that the money must be spent on the arts of peace, in making roads, draining morasses, and making the deserts blossom like the rose. [Applause.] We want the children taught how to go forth to the waste places of the earth as civilizers and helpers of their brothers, and not as destroyers. [Applause.] We want them given lessons very strongly bearing upon the human, the economic and the Christian aspects of the peace movement. We want these things taught in our schools specifically and continuously. Only in this way can we raise a future race of citizens who shall be civilized in reality and not only in name. [Applause.]

In my own Sunday School at home one Sunday a month I devote specifically to giving a lesson on international peace and brotherhood, and on another Sunday I give some story of moral heroism, teaching them that on the field of peace, in fighting flame and wave and pestilence, is true greatness. I try to teach them that the glory of manhood and womanhood is not on the red field of war, but on the green fields of peace, to make the earth the heaven that our Father meant it to be. [Applause.]

There is another great source of education, the nursery. Mothers, what are you doing to teach the little boys and girls in your home the arts of peace? Do you teach them to blow through silly little trumpets and to march up and down in imitation of those who cause the horrible carnage and crime of war? Do you teach them to wear cocked hats and to play with tin soldiers, instilling the virus of hatred into their young minds, taking the edge off their conscience, off their moral sense in the very days of their infancy?

I beg of you, preachers, teachers and mothers, think of the great trust committed to you in these young lives, and teach them a simple

Christianity, a Christianity of love, brotherhood and peace, a Christianity divested of elements which the child mind cannot understand. By teaching them that, every day and all days, in school, in church, in home — in that way shall we turn Cain into a Christ. [Applause.]

The meeting then adjourned.

Public Meeting in Park Street Church.

Thursday Evening, October 6.

THE REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS ON LAND AND SEA.

Hon. Samuel W. McCall, Member of Congress from Massachusetts, presided, and on calling the meeting to order at 8 o'clock said:

REMARKS OF HON. SAMUEL W. McCALL.

Ladies and Gentlemen: The meeting this evening is to discuss the subject of the reduction of armaments and the menace of great armies and great navies. One tendency of war is to become so deadly that men will cease fighting because of the frightful destruction of human life. Another tendency, I think no less marked, is that the weight of war is liable, constantly, to increase so that it will finally become unbearable; and whether it will fall with society underneath it and crush it, or whether mankind will have the sense, first, to cast off the incubus, is the subject to be discussed to-night by gentlemen well qualified to speak upon that subject.

That the burdens of war are increasing is very evident to one that has studied the tendency of things in our own country. The war bill of our United States is made up of three items: the cost of the army, the cost of the navy, and the pensions, because it has been the policy of the American people to generously pension those that serve in their army. Foreign states, to a certain extent, have a pension system, but they do not have it to the extent that we do. Our war bill is made up of those items.

Now, I will take the two great armed nations of continental Europe, France and Germany, whom we look upon as traditional enemies, who have frequently fought each other. In each of these countries it is said that when a peasant is born he has an armed man strapped on his back. The war cost of these two countries is something less than two hundred millions a year for one of them, and something less than four hundred millions for both of them. The war bill of the United States, the cost of its navy and of its army and of its pensions, is something like three hundred and fifty millions a year, more than that of France or of Germany, and almost as much as that of those two great nations together.

We are apt to think that we are isolated on this hemisphere, and without any great burdens of war, but that is not shown by any great scrutiny of facts. Some years ago there was some excuse for our having a military establishment. Our independence had barely been recognized; we had a large frontier; we had many savage tribes about us; we had three great countries as neighbors; and the boundary lines between us and them had not been determined, so that self-preservation required that we should be properly armed. But gradually those savage tribes disappeared; our neighbors one by one left us, until to-day we have only one great powerful neighbor on this continent, and madness itself could hardly force us into a war with that one. To-day we are, with two great allies on either side of us, in a place where we might realize the philosopher's dream and have peace.

I will not characterize the policy which, after we had come into the position where we might use the advantages which Providence had given us for peace, led us to seek new entries on seas where the great international conflicts of the age are to be waged and compelled us to arm ourselves; but that has been what we have done.

Now, if this burden goes on increasing, the burden that rests heavily on labor, it is going to make war, in the end, as I said in the beginning, almost insupportable. It is not a dream, I think, that we can throw off this burden, and I do not think that we need to wait for the complete triumph of Christianity or for the dawning of the golden age. It is not so far back in the past when men settled their private disputes by wager of battle, but finally they were led to refer them to courts and to accept the decisions of those tribunals; and it seems to me that it is perfectly feasible for the nations of the earth, in view of the great pressure on industry that is caused by force, to come to some agreement by which those armaments may be restricted.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is not my purpose to take your time to-night, because you have come here to listen to gentlemen who are much better qualified to speak on this subject than I am.

War, as I said, especially presses upon industry and labor. In the first place, it takes a great mass of men who would otherwise be engaged in holding up society and in bearing its burdens, and puts those men upon the back of society for society to carry. The burden is especially heavy upon laboring men. We are fortunate this evening in having with us a gentleman from Great Britain, who bears credentials from an organization representing some two millions of the laboring men of that country, and I will now introduce to you Mr. Pete Curran, who will speak to you from the standpoint of labor.

ADDRESS OF MR. PETE CURRAN.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been sent here to Boston for the purpose of interpreting the opinions of my fellow-workmen in the organized labor movements in the old country, and I can assure you that as far as the trade union element is concerned, we are absolutely unanimous in our protest against war, with its extravagance, irrespective of what nations may be involved. It may sound rather remarkable for a representative of Britain to take part in a meeting that has for its object the advocacy of disarmament, because we are generally recognized to be a people who are enthusiastic in our militarism; but, on behalf of the two millions of workers that I have mentioned, out of a population of forty millions, I know that I am expressing their sentiments when I say that they have always protested, and they are willing now to protest, against Great Britain entering into any war with any country, even for the purpose of that annexation which is supposed to bring back something to the working class. We have arrived at this conclusion, friends, and although we are in the minority, we are having some considerable influence, and our opinion will be felt in the forthcoming parliamentary election, so far as our protests against great national expenditures are concerned.

We believe that war for everyday gain, war for expansion of territory, brings about destitution among the poorer classes of the nations involved; and as we have had one recent forcible illustration of that, we are all the more desirous of joining hands with the other nations of the world for the purpose of securing amity and peace among the powers. You know that we conquered two republics within recent times. We spent two hundred and fifty million pounds in British money in conquering the two republics in South Africa, and the British flag waves in Pretoria and in the Orange Colony to-day.

We claim, as representative workers, that the wealth producer of the United Kingdom, either directly or indirectly, paid the whole of the money that was so extravagantly spent in that conquest. We have carefully watched what was likely to be the return, not only for the expenditure of our money, but for the shooting of many thousands of men, and to-day we are face to face with this problem: The men who went out in years gone by from the county of Cornwall, and the men who were raised in the tin mining industry in that part of the country, are to-day turned away from the mines of Africa, and the speculators of that country who were responsible, with some of our statesmen, for the war, are bringing in Chinamen to take the places, at a starving rate of wages, of the white men who formerly filled the places.

In looking over the history of the wars that have taken place between our country and others, we have arrived at the conclusion that, from a moral point of view, and, above all, from a humanitarian point of view, we are justified in throwing the weight of our whole organization on the side of those who are endeavoring to establish international peace. And you people — and when I say you people in America, or when I say we in England engaged in those wars, I do not think it is altogether a proper term. We, the common people in England, were not consulted as to whether our statesmen should embark in that enterprise. You in America, the rate payers, were not consulted prior to your government going forward on an exploitation of similar description in the Philippine Islands; and, in my humble judgment as a foreigner, the returns to the American taxpayer out of the Philippine Islands will not be much greater than they are to us from our South African colonies that we have just annexed.

We in the old country have a great many problems confronting us; owing to the density of population in the large industrial centres we have one of the most important problems confronting us to-day that could confront any class of workers in any country of the world. I mean the housing problem. We have been endeavoring for some years to persuade the government to empower our municipalities, our local governing bodies, to borrow government money at a small percentage, so that in the suburbs of our various cities we might be able to establish, at a nominal rate, healthy homes for our industrial artisans; but, instead of utilizing the money to provide employments of a useful character for the men and the women who are starving on our streets, instead of spending the money to erect healthy artisans' dwellings or in furnishing good facilities for their erection, this great equipment of army and navy is going on and the millions are being spent in that way. You people in America, I fear, or, at least, your governing bodies, are copying the example of the old country. I always thought you were an admirable people until you embarked, or allowed your rulers to embark, in the Philippine expedition; but I very much fear that since you embarked in that expedition your responsible rulers are taking up the very sordid view that has misled our rulers and led them into this extravagant expenditure within the last half century.

You are building battleships. Well, I do not like to see the American government building battleships, and I am not sure that you will require those battleships after they are built. I hope you will not. As far as my judgment carries me, looking at international relations from the most sordid points of view, the American people have nothing to fear from any European power, not even Great Britain; because, though we are strong on territorial annexation, though the sun never sets on British imperial possessions, as our patriots declare, — and unfortunately never shines on some of our possessions, — though our British statesmen have the patriotic desire to annex portions of other peoples' countries, there is not the slightest fear of anything in the shape of warfare breaking out between Uncle Sam and John Bull; and there is no power in Europe, in our judgment, that you people have need to fear. Therefore, instead of the building of battleships, your statesmen ought not only to express sympathy with international peace, but to give us a practical illustration of their purpose by refusing to spend the nation's money on a navy which will never be required to defend your country.

Some statesmen say that the best way to bring about peace is to make preparations for war. I honestly cannot subscribe to that statement. Some nation, some great power, will have to set an example to the weaker powers by reducing its armament to the most meagre proportions; and there is no country in the world which can better afford to do that than the United States of America.

There is one further aspect of our international relationship that working men in England recognize: we have in both countries people who, in the commercial world, are anxious to extend their own business. I am not going to attribute dishonest motives either to those in this country or ours. The view of men is the result of their environment, and the people who to-day are engaged in developing your trusts, in utilizing large profits to absorb the small concerns, and thus acquiring the power to go forth and control the world, — these men, either in England or America, are not the people whom we can trust to bring about international peace. That same ambition that prompts their commercial nature, or the commercial side of their nature, to absorb the smaller concerns, prompts them when they become rulers of the state to try to get control of as much foreign territory as possible. But I have great reliance on the workers of the world. With all due respect to every other class I believe a great deal of the advancement of this movement will depend on the attitude of the industrial classes. The industrial classes, either in England or America, and perhaps more in America than in the old country, because of your more democratic franchise, can, if they make up their minds to do so, make or unmake governments; and when they do make up their minds that international peace shall prevail, they will be able to bring about that consummation without much delay. [Applause.]

I am informed that here in Boston, and indeed all over the United States, the churches and the pastors are helping in this great peace movement. That is certainly a good sign of the times. If there is one thing more contemptible to me than any other, it is the clerical gentlemen pronouncing a benediction upon the troops when they are going forth to slay brothers with whom they have no quarrel. That has been done in our country by men who occupy high apostolic positions. We may be considered skeptical, but we believe that the Founder of Christianity would never bless the troops leaving any shore to slay brethren in another country. [Applause.]

If the industrial side of the community will join hands with the commercial and clerical sides, then, in the old country and in America, we shall be able to put our heads together and to establish that international amity and peace which is the honest and sincere desire of every Christian man and woman.

The Chairman: We have with us this evening a distinguished gentleman from Germany, who has for many years been engaged in work for international peace. I now have the pleasure of introducing to you, as the next speaker, Mr. Richard Feldhaus.

REMARKS OF MR. RICHARD FELDHAUS.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Permit me to appeal to your indulgence, which I need very much, for I am in a very difficult position. I only speak your language a little. I shall speak only a few words, and I shall speak these to all of you regardless of class distinctions. I shall try to speak the truth, for only for truth is society concerned.

It is a great subject which has brought us from the most distant parts of the world to the city of Boston. Universal peace is to come from the work of the Peace Congresses, but naturally that will be much later. In ancient times, two thousand years ago, Horace condemned "execrable" war, and even three thousand years ago it was said, "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not steal." The spirit of peace has not yet conquered after all these centuries, and there are those who are accustomed to say that there always will be wars. This is a trite saying, but it is not true.

In the days of the early Peace Congresses, at Paris, in 1849, your Mr. Burritt spoke of the great progress of the peace movement even at that time. Mr. Burritt traveled from one country to another, going everywhere, and speaking against the continuance of war. He addressed himself to the heart of man. The peace apostle of the present day addresses himself more to reason. In this propaganda against war the late John de Bloch has become very famous. I can only advise you to read his great book entitled, "The Future of War," in which he has pointed out the great objections to future war in Europe. The end of such a war, he thinks, would be a general revolution. He depicts the certain bankruptcy of continental Europe, if they do not very soon check the great peril. He points out that the treasuries of Europe will some day be emptied, and the people brought to bankruptcy, and he tells us that at present every man in Europe sacrifices the labor of one month of the year for war and preparations for slaughter.

At the first Peace Congress in Germany, at Frankfurt, in 1850, an Indian chief had come over from America, who wanted to see civilized Europe. When he passed through Woolwich in England and saw all the sacrifices that were made for war in constructing the different instruments to kill men with, and when all was explained to him, he exclaimed, shaking his head: "Educated Europeans are far greater savages than our Indians in the primeval forests."

Unfortunately, among our antagonists, especially in Europe, there are many who are not ashamed to pretend that it is Christianity that demands war and its terrible institutions. Is it not blasphemy against our Lord? They say the time has not come to realize our demand and to execute our ideals. It may be, but the present is the time to prepare for them. Fortunately, in Germany people are now beginning to recognize these truths. The organization of peace numbers about seventy sections in as many towns. Another thing which has surprised the political world is the great progress which arbitration is now making in Germany, and I believe if the Hague Conference should take place once more the German government would not again be on the side of the adversaries of this grand idea.

I want to state to you Americans some words that John de Bloch spoke at the Hague Conference. De Bloch said that the great occurrence of the nineteenth century was not Waterloo or Austerlitz, but that it was the Hague Conference. Our century is too enlightened to have any further war, and to my mind it appears impossible that between civilized people wars can any longer take place. I stand with the Hague Tribunal, and not with armies and fleets.

I want to finish with a little anecdote. An explorer of Africa, who, it is said, never shed blood throughout his peaceful conquest of that country, told us that he once performed a ceremony in the presence of a king, namely, the "funeral of war." The chiefs were suddenly summoned. They dug a hole in the sand and they threw into it some weapons and covered them over with earth. Upon this they planted in the ground in which the implements of war rested a young tree, which should grow and become the sign of the newly made friendship.

Let us try to follow the example and to dig the grave for war and plant upon it the tree of peace; and, not only as a symbol, but in reality, we ought to transform our implements of war into ploughshares, and to plant justice and friendship. One day this tree will obtain a footing in the ground and will continue to flourish and to spread out its full branches towards heaven. At its feet it will protect the tender stalks and plants, and one day all humanity will be protected and defended against the deeds of might. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I shall now introduce to you one who, although a soldier for more than forty years, is a devoted friend of peace, General Nelson A. Miles.

ADDRESS OF GENERAL NELSON A. MILES.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The honorable presiding officer propounded questions in his remarks as to what would produce the end of war. He said that it was possible that the expense would become so enormous and the destruction of human life so serious that this would induce nations and people to cease settling their controversies by the great arbitrament of war. Another reason was the great expense of maintaining the armies and starting them on campaigns. The first will not succeed. The fact that weapons of war are more destructive now than formerly does not increase the loss of life in great campaigns. The wars of the Cæsars and the Napoleons were as destructive as those at the present time. The fact that we use longer range weapons, longer range canons and high explosives simply has changed the tactics, and battles are fought at longer distances. We see, consequently, the line of battle thirty or forty miles in extent. We see, again, ships engaging each other at a distance of five miles. In fact, the field of Waterloo would hardly be large enough to manœuvre well a division of troops equipped with rapid-fire field artillery and long range rifles and field guns.

There is, however, another reason which will undoubtedly prove successful, and that is the enormous expense, the burden upon the people of maintaining the great armies. A single battleship costs five millions of dollars and more. A high-power gun costs some thirty or forty thousand dollars. Its encasement costs as much more. A single discharge from that gun costs a thousand dollars; so that the expensive armament of the great armies and navies of the present time involves an expenditure which will bankrupt the nations of the world if it is continued.

War is different now from what it was in the old times when the man could take the gun from the antler and go to war, as our fathers did. They did not have to prepare for battle because they could live for a time upon the country which they devastated, and then return to their accustomed modes of life. But now the great armies are maintained day after day, week after week, year after year, at enormous expense, and the navies in the same way, thus involving the placing of the great burden upon the people that cannot much longer remain.

We see in the papers this evening an admirable letter from the great philanthropist, the man who has done so much good by giving good books and by other benevolent works in which he advises that five great powers unite and dictate the suppression of war. This is most excellent so far as it goes, but it does not reach the case fully. An assembling or uniting of the powers of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France and possibly Austria, for the purpose of closing the war in the Orient, would be a treaty of peace among those nations for a time, but it would not reach the result in which you are interested and in which the best people of the world are now interested. There should be a congress of nations in which all the powers, whether they be the great military powers or the humble powers that are struggling along happy and peaceful with their own little governments in their own country, should be represented. It should be one grand confederation of all the civilized nations of the world, in which an understanding should be reached which should govern and should dictate the policies of all nations on the earth for all time. Then we should see the burden of war and of preparation for war lessened far more than by any other measure that I can possibly conceive of.

Human progress, like the mighty glacier, is imperceptible, yet its advance is incessant and irresistible. It is like the morning light that breaks forth from the shadow of darkness to illumine the world, like seeds sown in the good ground which produce the golden harvest. It is fitting that in this enlightened, progressive community, this atmosphere of liberty, this grand old Commonwealth, the subject of peace, of a congress of nations, should be discussed by this council of eminent men and honorable women. Here, in its birthplace, where such progressive champions of thought as William Ellery Channing, Charles Sumner and their associates first established this society of peace and proclaimed its principles, is a most suitable place to hold such a convention as is gathered in this city. In a just cause principles are of far more importance than mere numbers. Hence, the humane and exalted ideas of those two men have spread all over the world and found response and sympathy in the hearts of every nation. The history of every nation has been largely the history of its wars.

The brave, the true. the honorable have been justly revered in all times, and all lands attempt to crown with great glory heroic deeds and heroic sacrifices.

The settlement of controversies by the arbitrament of war involves the destruction of hundreds of thousands of the young men of both countries. Could any rule or method be more void of reason and justice? Yet such has been the history of the race since the earliest age, and in modern wars the evidences of barbarism are still apparent. To illustrate what has been the sacrifice to the demon of carnage, it is estimated that the wars to gratify the ambition of Bonaparte cost Europe five millions of lives and the devastation of many countries. In our great Civil War more than one million five hundred thousand young men enlisted before they were twenty years of age, many leaving home for the first time, never to return. More than half a million of the very flower of America's young manhood went to untimely graves in that terrible conflict. That was a loss to the nation that can never be reckoned. We may well ask what would have been the condition of the human family to-day if the bravest and best, the noblest and most unselfish could have lived, rather than have been sacrificed on the red fields of war in every country and every age.

To drift from a strong race into a nation of non-combatants would undoubtedly be a misfortune to the people and a detriment to the country. Fortunately, there is a wiser and better course. There is one upward step before we reach the highest plane of human development. We need not follow the example of those nations that have drifted into decay and subserviency to the strong and powerful; neither need we follow the example of the cruel and oppressive nations that have by the forces of their mighty armies and powerful navies overcome weaker and more peaceful countries. The great majority of the wars of the world's history have been occasioned by the ambition of some usurper or great tyrant to undertake to get control of the territory or the affairs of some people. The deadly war now being waged between the two nations of the Orient cannot benefit either country. It must impoverish both of the antagonists for years. It cannot benefit mankind.

In an interview with Nicholas II, Autocrat of all the Russias, I found him greatly interested in that great trans-Siberian railway, that new way around the world. He had been over the route himself before he became emperor, and was ambitious to open that line, to open the settlements of that vast territory. He was more interested in the full development of that country than in the development of his army. It is said by all that the glory of his reign will be that he called the Hague Conference together and advocated wise and humane arbitration in order to lessen the burdens of the people who are sustaining great standing armies. It is to be regretted that the representatives who talked most about peace in the Hague Conference have not manifested more zeal in the question of universal peace. I have no sympathy with that sentiment of peace that would compromise and arbitrate between powerful nations and, at the same time, overrun, intimidate, or subjugate the people of defenseless countries.

Never in the world's history were there as many men drilled and disciplined for war purposes as at the present time. Never was the expense of armament, of equipment of troops with modern destructive engines of war as great and burdensome as now. Never were the burdens of maintaining great armies and navies as heavy upon the people as at the present time, when the ingenuity and skill of mankind have brought the nations into close communication, when steam power, electricity and wireless telegraphy have formed the people of every country into one grand brotherhood of common interests, when distance and time have been annihilated. But the peace, prosperity and welfare of every nation make a demand that the burdens of maintaining the national forces shall be reduced to a minimum, and that there shall be one grand congress for the adjudication and settlement of international differences and promoting the true grandeur of nations.

Several years ago, when our army was below the standard of safety and efficiency, and later when we had a superabundance, I had the honor to recommend that the government adopt a standard — one soldier for every thousand of the population — for the force of the nation that should be commensurate with our population, wealth and national requirements. The idea is simple and perfectly feasible, and has since been practically adopted by our country, and we shall have the glory of setting a good example and commending it to every nation. Washington's idea was that he and his compatriots should establish a government that would make barriers against the encroachments of tyranny, and they provided a constitution that was better fitted to do so than any other constitution ever framed; and he wrote to Lafayette that he hoped it would be administered with integrity, that in time the people of this country should have the glory of commending it to the people of other countries who were then strangers to it. It was not his idea that they could frame a constitution and adopt a system of government and then force it upon other people of the world, but that they could commend it, that they could administer it with such wisdom and integrity that it would commend itself to the intelligence of the world. Therefore, in military matters we should set an example to the world.

It must be apparent to all peaceful patriotic men that the intelligent world will not long endure the burden of the present great standing armies and enormously expensive navies, and there never has been a more favorable time than at present for a candid, free and impartial discussion of this subject. The question as to what the millions of men would do, if unemployed in military service, is answered by the fact that they would become producers instead of consumers. A wonderful inheritance is ours. Within the waiting portion of our fields and mines there is a greater wealth than has been seen over all the earth. Being heirs to this last and best earthly estate, we should devote our lives to utilizing these blessings for the uplifting of every people and the welfare of mankind. There are many times more material wealth in the sparsely settled countries of North and South America, occupied by one hundred and fifteen millions of people, than in all the remainder of the earth, occupied by more than a thousand millions of the human race.

In the promotion of the peaceful arts and industries, our people have won a place in the word's confidence and respect in which all take just pride. In these splendid activities there is no sound of cannon or of dying men. In the most picturesque valley of the world, on the right bank of the beautiful Hudson, there is a great university that will cost, when completed, fifty millions of dollars, dedicated to the uses of war. On the banks of that majestic river, there will also be established a citadel dedicated to the spirit of peace.

The ancient and refined Athenians erected costly monuments and temples to the unknown gods. I trust that we shall build temples of equal grandeur and beauty for the living present. Some benevolent, noble hearted, public-spirited men have already inaugurated a movement to celebrate fittingly all the important events in the history of our country, and also to build and permanently establish an institution which shall be devoted to the education and enlightenment of the many millions of our Southern people. Such a group of institutions has long been needed near the great metropolis of our wealth and industry.

In the smoke and toil of our business enterprises the spirit of good shall go forth and prevail to bless our land and all other lands and the people therein. It will say to the world that true glory lies not in great empires filled with dead men's bones, but in those deeds of charity and beneficence that light our earth as heaven is lit by the stars.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is a distinguished preacher from the city of New York, the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, the Rev. Charles E. Jefferson.

ADDRESS OF REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In the words of an ancient Hebrew writer, "there be three things that are too wonderful for me." There are four that I know not, and those things, I think, are more perplexing and baffling than those which perplexed and discomfited the ancient Hebrew. The first thing is that in the year of our Lord 1904 the nations of the earth should walk around, like Hamlet's father, armed from top to toe, from head to foot, and all be ready to fight at the drop of a hat. We expect that sort of thing in the earlier stages of human development, when men are raw and have not mastered the first principles of living. We are not surprised when we find it in cannibal islands or far-off wildernesses where men run wild like dogs and wolves. We are not surprised when we find it in the back woods of Kentucky or the farthest mining camp. But that in the most civilized parts of the globe, where education has done her ablest work, where cultivation has reached its highest pitch, and where the hearts of men have grown gentle and human hands have learned the divine art of helping, the leading nations should be weighted down with weapons, not with weapons formed after the fashion of polite society, but with weapons slung over the shoulder, strapped on the back, dangling from the hips, just as if they were so many cut-throats or outlaws or bar-room thugs ready to fly at one another's throats, — that is one thing that to me is wonderful.

And this is the second thing that is wonderful: that the weight of the armaments seems to be proportioned to the national profession of allegiance to Jesus Christ. It is the Christian nations that are the most heavily armed. It is where the Bible has been taught the longest and where it is the most generally read and accepted that the guns are the biggest and that the swords have been whetted to the finest edge. The nations that have built the cross into their architecture, woven it into the fabric of their civilization, have brought forth as the consummate flower of their civilization the torpedo boat and the torpedo boat destroyer. The nations that have placed the crown on the head of the Prince of Peace and most loudly proclaimed him the Lord of all are the nations that are the most proficient in multiplying the instruments of destruction. That the Christian nations should permit Mauser rifles and Gatling guns, lyddite shells, twelve-inch projectiles and floating mines around the cross of the Son of God, with his great words vibrating in the ear, "All that take the sword shall perish with the sword," — that to me is wonderful.

And this is the third wonderful thing: that with the weight of the armies increasing year by year, the war budgets are going up in the countries of Europe, and in our country, too. It was only about twenty-five years ago that Von Moltke said that all Europe was groaning under the weight of an armed peace. But the weight then was as nothing compared with the weight to-day. The old nations are staggering, threatened with national bankruptcy, and the great world powers, struggling under the unbearable weight, cry out, "Who shall deliver us from the body of this death?" But all the time the terrible weight increases and grows heavier and heavier, and the wise men nod with approval and benediction. That to me is wonderful.

But the most wonderful thing of all is that nobody wants to fight; nobody wants to use the armaments; all the world's rulers are men of peace; all the world's statesmen are men of peace — they always say that when they ask for appropriations. The merchants the world over abhor war because they know that it means havoc to commerce, and throws the trade of the world into chaos. The wage earning masses, as we have been told to-night, are more and more coming to spurn and despise war because they know that when it comes they will furnish the food for the bullets and that upon their shoulders will ultimately fall the burdens which war creates; and the military chieftains, — the great generals, — they too are men of peace, and they very frankly tell us that war is barbarism, it is savagery, it is hell.

Yet, strange to say, it seems to be because we are so desperately and passionately in favor of peace that the armaments keep right on growing. We are building up our armies and navies in order to keep the peace. It has become a maxim in many circles that the surest guarantee of peace is the preparedness for war, and a United States senator not long ago declared that upon the efficacy of our national armament depends the peace of our nation. That is what the rulers are saying the wide world over. Is n't it singular that we have got into all this expense because we are determined to preserve the peace? Is n't it singular that it should become axiomatic that the only possible way to keep from fighting is to gird yourself for battle, the only way to preserve a peaceful disposition is to keep your eyes fixed on slaughter, the only way to cultivate kindly sentiments in others is to make yourself look as ferocious as you can, and if you are in dead earnest in the work of saving men, just give your days and nights to making yourselves expert in the art of shedding blood? That to me is the most wonderful thing of all.

In hours of bewilderment and despondency I think one is tempted to repeat with Mark Anthony, "Oh, judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason!" But in our sensible hours we know that that is not true. Judgment has not fled to brutish beasts and men have not lost their reason. The world seems to be mad at times, but there is method sometimes in its madness. It is too involved in that idea that a nation must, first of all, defend itself against possible encroachment, against possible wrong, and so long as one nation arms itself to the teeth, all the other nations will feel that they must arm themselves too. That, I think, accounts for the whole terrible tragedy, and that is why it is that this subject of the reduction of armaments is the most difficult phase of all the peace problem.

There are many men, earnest advocates of peace, who believe in great navies and great armies. There are many men who believe in arbitration, who talk for it and work for it, who do not want to reduce the military establishments. When twenty-six nations sent their representatives to the Hague Conference the representatives discussed a variety of topics and introduced enormous reforms, but they did not dare to touch the reduction of armaments so much as with the tip of their finger; and the reason I think is that arguments can effect so little in this phase of the problem. You can say it is too foolish, and it is. You can say it is wicked, and you can bear down hard on the word "wicked." You can say it is diabolical to spend this money and waste the national resources and take the bread out of the mouths of the children and break the back of the peasant and block the progress of the education, the philanthropy and religious work of the world.

All that is true, but somehow or other these arguments do not seem to effect anything. Nothing has been said in the United States Congress or the Reichstag or in the British Parliament or the French

Chamber of Deputies towards carrying reduction of armaments into effect. It is foolish to spend six or seven million dollars on a battleship that is likely to be antiquated before it is ever used. It is wicked for the United States to spend a hundred million dollars a year on its navy in times of peace when it has not an enemy in the world, when we need every dollar of the money in the care and lifting up of eight millions of black men into the light of God; wicked, I think, to spend these hundreds of millions on our armies and navies with this great mass of ignorance festering in our great cities, constituting a darkness blacker than darkest Africa; wicked for countries to put such weight on the backs of their citizens as to drive thousands of them into anarchy and atheism.

Of course we know it is dangerous. Great armies and great navies are not a guarantee of peace. They are a standing menace to the peace of the world. Although the Hague Court may be firmly established, just so long as the great drums keep beating and the great guns keep booming and every day the battleships are drawn in battle line, just so long the blood of men will be feverish, and war, like a beast, will crouch at our door. Of course it is dangerous. Goliath never is so eager for a scrap as when he has his armor on. Never does he strut so insolently and boast so loudly as when he feels the great saber in his hand. You cannot fill the papers of a nation day after day, week after week, year after year with pictures of battleships and torpedo boats and destroyers, bombs and projectiles and shells, without lowering the tone of the national mind, coarsening the feeling of the national heart, and strengthening the reign of the idolatry of military glory. You cannot pile up powder in heaps here and there throughout this world in which are so many men carrying matches, without inviting and making inevitable frequent and terrific explosions.

But while we all admit that it is dangerous for the world to do it, it is not dangerous for one nation to do it. There is the rub. It is wicked, oh, so wicked, for all to do it, but not wicked for one. The wise men of the world have said, "No, it is not wicked, it is not foolish for one nation to do it, for our neighbors are doing it all around." So we see now what we must do for the solidarity of the race. God has made all the nations of one blood. They feel there is greater military safety for all to keep together than for one of them to break away and do what it thinks is steadily right. Nations are not idealists. They all cling to the earth. They would rather walk four legs on the ground and keep together than to fly separately into the air.

Therefore we are dealing to-night with an international problem. No one nation can discuss it adequately. No one nation can settle it. America will never lay down her arms alone, I fear. Indeed, I know she will not, because she has not the faith to walk along that dim and perilous way unattended; nor will England or France or Germany or Italy or Russia. The nations must come together. There must be frequent conferences at The Hague. There must be frequent comings together of the friends of peace. There must be a federation of the nations. There must be an international congress, a parliament of the world. What we want is atmosphere. We cannot pound off the armor. It must be melted off by an atmosphere made warm with goodwill. When we know each other better we shall not want to go armed. Brothers we are and have always been and ever shall be, and every heart the wide world over, in its better hours, beats true to the music of the Golden Rule; for have we not, after all, one Father, and has not one God created us? You cannot break the armor, but it can be melted. The enginery of force will not be broken down by the rapid blows of logic, nor will it go down before the forces of philanthropy nor the developments of science, but it will be melted, it will dissolve, it will pass away under the rising tide of love, for it is as true now as when the Prophet heard it: "Not by might nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord."

The meeting then adjourned.

At the close of the public meetings on Thursday evening a reception was given by the German societies of Boston to the German-speaking foreign delegates. Addresses were made by the Baroness von Suttner, Professor Quidde and others, and the occasion was a most instructive and enthusiastic one.

The same evening also a most successful meeting was held for the Italian citizens of Boston, which was addressed by E. T. Moneta from Milan, A. Capece Minutolo from Rome, and others.

Fourth Business Session.

Friday Morning, October 7, 1904.

The meeting was called to order at 10 o'clock, in Park Street Church, and in the absence of the President, Dr. W. Evans Darby was asked to take the chair temporarily.

The Chairman: The first business of the morning is a report from Committee B on "Pacigerance," or a general league of peace among states. The report was first prepared by Mr. Fredrik Bajer of Denmark, the President of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, and the Committee, after examining it, has asked Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood to report it to the Congress.

The report presented by Mrs. Lockwood was as follows:

FORM OF A MODEL TREATY FOR A PACIFIC ALLIANCE OF STATES.

Whereas, Article 27 of the protocol of the Hague Convention of 1899 imposes upon the signatory powers "the duty, in case of a serious conflict threatening to break out between two or more of them, of reminding these that the permanent tribunal is open to them"; and

Whereas, The fulfillment of this duty will be greatly facilitated if this reminder comes from a confederacy of powers, whereby their weight of authority will be increased and their responsibility lessened in proportion to the number of powers thus joined together for this purpose; and

Whereas, As this matter now stands, there is no concert of action proposed, or feasible plan, whereby the admirable machinery of the Hague Court may be put in force to prevent war, where war is threatened, and the present disastrous conflict between Russia and Japan shows unmistakably that some power more potent and rational than brute force is needed to prevent the useless sacrifice of human life and property, now become such an object lesson to the civilized and uncivilized world;

The following form of a Model Treaty for a Pacific Alliance of States is recommended to the powers for consideration:

I. The high contracting powers, mutually recognizing each other's absolute sovereignity and independence, bind themselves, each for itself, to work together for the furtherance of universal peace.

II. The high contracting powers pledge themselves to refer to the Permanent Arbitral Tribunal (established by the Convention for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, signed at The Hague, July 29, 1899) every dispute which may arise between them that cannot be solved by diplomacy, or some other amicable method agreed upon, whatever the cause, nature or object, of the disagreement may be; and further pledge themselves not to engage in any warlike action, directly or indirectly, with respect to each other.

III. Each of the high contracting powers shall in turn take the presidency of the Union so contemplated, and on its accession shall fulfill the task of securing the united method of procedure decided upon in Article IV. below, which has for its object the fulfillment of the duty imposed by Article 27 of the above-named Hague Convention.

IV. On the first of January each year the presidency of the Union shall pass to that one of the high contracting powers whose name follows alphabetically, in French, that of the power whose presidency has expired. When the list of the high contracting powers has been gone through, the presidency shall be transferred back to that power in the Union which stands first alphabetically. Which power shall have the presidency the first year shall be determined by lot.

If a power whose turn it is to preside finds itself at war, the turn passes over to the next power alphabetically.

V. In case an acute contention shall threaten to break out between two or more powers, the other high contracting powers shall immediately, by a collective note, remind them that the permanent tribunal is open to them.

The power which holds the presidency shall, for this purpose, be provided with the full authority needed. Its adherence to the Union carries with it a binding duty to fulfill this task.

Also, it shall be the duty of the presiding power to offer to the powers in mutual contention, if it should seem advisable to do so, the "good offices" of the Union or their mediation.

This duty shall in no wise lessen the right of any of the high contracting powers to offer its own good offices or mediation to the powers at strife, nor shall the action of the Union relieve any of the high contracting powers from the duty of using all means within reach to secure a peaceful or judicial solution of the conflict.

VI. If any of the high contracting powers shall desire to withdraw from the present treaty, such withdrawal shall not come into force until one year after it has notified the remaining powers, and only then with respect to the powers which it has notified.

VII. This convention is open to all powers on sending their adhesion to the presiding power.

At the close of Mrs. Lockwood's report Mr. W. R. Cremer, Vice-President of the British Delegation, was asked by Dr. Darby to take the chair.

Mrs. Lockwood then gave the history of the work which had finally resulted in the drafting of this form of a Model Treaty. The Interparliamentary Conference at Vienna in 1903 had unanimously adopted a resolution presented by Fredrik Bajer from the Danish Interparliamentary Group, containing the substance of the proposition which she had just made, but without the machinery of execution. The Vienna Conference of the Interparliamentary Union had "expressed" its desire that the powers which signed the Hague Convention should as far as possible agree to act in concert, and in the most practical way, to fulfill the engagement which Article 27 of the Hague Convention lays upon them.

The fourth Scandinavian Peace Congress held at Stein, July 25, 1901, had adopted a resolution declaring it to be the duty of states to proclaim themselves fundamentally and permanently neutral, to prevent the employment of force in their reciprocal relations, to conclude treaties of obligatory arbitration, and to act in common, in the most practical way, to fulfill the obligations imposed by Article 27 of the Hague Convention.

In October, 1900, Mr. Bajer secured, through the Peace Bureau, the appointment of a committee to study the most practical method of forming a Pacific Alliance of States. The committee consisted of Fredrik Bajer, Henri La Fontaine, Emile Arnaud, Baroness von Suttner and J. Novicow. The committee held three meetings: at Berne, March, 1901; at Glasgow, October, 1901; and at Monaco, April, 1902. The result of the work of this committee was two papers, one by Fredrik Bajer, the other by Emile Arnaud. The two had much in common, and out of them came the report submitted to the Thirteenth Congress. This form of a Model Treaty was believed to be a reasonable and practical one for a Pacific Alliance, and if it should be adopted would do much to avoid war, as the Hague Convention had done.

Mrs. Lockwood then called attention to the many notable cases of differences settled by arbitration before the Hague Court was established, and also to those adjusted by that Court, and urged these as sufficient proof that all international differences could be disposed of by pacific means. The Hague Court was the crowning glory of the nineteenth century, and would be the salvation of the peoples of the twentieth. In spite of the wars since engaged in, the principle of arbitration, of judicial settlement, was not thereby weakened. The devastating war in the East furnished a new evidence of war's utterly bad and inhuman character.

A further committee, Mrs. Lockwood stated, had been appointed on the subject of "Pacigerence" at the Glasgow Peace Congress, 1901. They had also studied the subject, and doubtless all approved in substance of Mr. Bajer's Model Treaty.

The work of the Pan-American Congress at Mexico City in 1901-2, which she outlined, and the recent signing of ten treaties of obligatory arbitration by the nations of Western Europe, which she named, had brought the work of peace making many steps forward, and prepared the way more perfectly for a general Pacific Union of the nations. This was especially true of the Netherlands-Denmark treaty, which provided for the future submission of all disputes between the contracting parties to the Hague Court.

Mrs. Lockwood also called attention to various steps which had been taken in the Belgian Senate, by President Roosevelt, and elsewhere, to still further perfect the machinery of international peace, and to bring to an end the conflict between Russia and Japan, and argued in conclusion that the time seemed to be ripe for the adoption of some such general scheme as that outlined in the proposed Model Treaty, which would provide an effective means of preserving peace in the future.

At the close of Mrs. Lockwood's report Dr. Hale asked the privilege of presenting to the Congress some letters which he had received.

Dr. E. E. Hale: These letters have been entrusted to me because, in a personal interview with the reverend Archbishop of this New England Diocese, he wished me to express to this assembly the thorough interest of the Roman Catholic Church in the proceedings here, and to say that he had appointed his Vicar-General to be present at the meeting. The Vicar-General has modestly asked me to state that it is the intention of the church with their prayers and coöperation of every sort to assist this Congress; that it is their desire to employ every practicable method of showing that they are in sympathy with the modern movement in favor of universal peace.

I received this morning a letter from the Catholic Cardinal at Baltimore, in which he wishes to recommend to the Peace Congress the gentleman who will be here to represent Belgium in the interest of the Congo State. I think His Eminence is probably aware that the feeling here is very strongly not in sympathy with the Belgian government in its affairs in the Congo State, but I feel that we must give a fair chance to the distinguished representative of the king of the Belgians when he shall speak.

The Archbishop regrets that he cannot be present. He made, perhaps, the best speech delivered at the great Peace Meeting in Washington on January 15 last, and his interest is very great in every movement taken in behalf of universal peace.

The letters are as follows:

St. Cecilia's Rectory, Belvidere St., Boston, Mass.,
September 26, 1904.

Rev. Edward E. Hale, D. D., South Congregational Church.

Dear Rev. Sir: This is written in reply to your letter in relation to religious services in connection with the Peace Congress about to meet in Boston. The Archbishop has delegated me to attend the meetings of the Peace Congress and to respond to all inquiries and requests arising from the officials and promoters of the same.

Your courteous offer of the use of your church for a religious service conducted by Catholic ecclesiastics, as one of the services of devotional exercises in view of the deliberations of the Peace Congress, is received and thankfully acknowledged. While it is our intention to aid with our prayers and coöperation the aims of the Peace Congress, it would be too inconvenient to do this in the manner you suggest. We must be content with some other mode of showing that we are in accord with the modern movement in favor of universal peace.

Yours truly,
William Byrne, V. G.

Archdiocese of Baltimore — Chancery Office,
408 Charles Street, Baltimore,
October 4, 1904.

Rev. Edward Everett Hale, Peace Congress, Boston.

Dear Sir: I regret exceedingly that many pressing engagements prevent me from assisting at the Peace Conference in Boston. Had I been able to be present, I would make it my duty to say a word in vindication of the policy of Belgium in the Congo State. The representatives of the different European powers at the Berlin Conference were compelled to express their admiration and praise of the noble ideals of the founder of the Congo State and of the splendid results achieved through his humane policy.

The Italian representative, speaking of the perseverance of the king of the Belgians in the civilization and development of the Congo State, said: "For eight years with rare constancy, he (the king) has spared neither trouble nor personal sacrifice for the success of a generous and philanthropic enterprise."

In terms no less flattering spoke the British representative, Sir Edward Malet, and likewise "Chinese" Gordon. Lord Curzon, too, says: "The Congo State has done a great work, and, by its administration, the cruel raids of Arab slave-dealers have ceased to exist over many thousand square miles." It may be added that this happy consummation was not reached without the copious shedding of generous Belgian blood. But civilization and commercial prosperity advanced apace, and in an incredibly short time, — so efficient, so humane was the policy, — where before had been a wilderness, now a garden flourishes instead. The civilization, the development, the present prosperity of the Congo State, the peace that now nestles in its once turbulent bosom, are all the fruits of the toil and sacrifice of the Belgians.

Keeping in view all this, it would be greatly to be regretted that a Conference which bears the very name of Peace — which was inaugurated in the interests of peace — should discuss a question which is calculated to arouse enmity and strife. Moreover, such a discussion would of necessity be one-sided and unfair, in so much as the representatives of the Belgian government would have no opportunity to reply to the charges made against its administration of the Congo, nor to present their own case.

In the past, when the Congo began to thrive, when happy prosperity began to smile upon her rivers and plains, charges were made from the outside against the Belgian administration of the Congo; but the Belgian authorities have always been able to refute thoroughly and successfully all these accusations against misrule and violation of agreements, etc.

I am, yours very sincerely,

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

The Secretary announced more letters and telegrams of greeting to the Congress.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further in the discussion of the subject introduced by Mrs. Lockwood, Mr. Green has a message from the Socialists, which we will afford him an opportunity to present.

MR. J. F. GREEN: *Mr. Chairman:* I had the pleasure, with our friend and comrade, the interpreter, Mr. Smith, Mr. Herbert Burrows, Mr. Pete Curran and Dr. Clark, of addressing the Socialists' Convention of Massachusetts two or three days ago in this city, and they have since handed me a resolution, which I will read to you.

The resolution read by Mr. Green expressed hearty fraternal greetings to the Congress, a sincere desire for the success of its deliberations, and that war between nations might become a thing of the past and peace and goodwill among men obtain throughout the world. It declared war to be a relic of the days of savagery, no longer suited to our times; that it was but an instrument in the hands of the owning and exploiting classes of all nations. It declared the Socialist Party in Massachusetts as elsewhere to be the implacable enemy of all war, that the problem of universal peace was fundamentally in the hands of the working class, and that the Socialist movement presented the only remedy which struck at the tap-root of all war and presented the only hope of permanent and universal peace.

MR. H. LA FONTAINE then offered the following resolution in support of the proposition contained in Mrs. Lockwood's report:

"The Congress recalls the terms of Article 27 of the Hague Convention, by which the signatory powers have imposed on themselves the duty, in case of any serious conflict breaking out, or being about to break out, between two or more of them, of reminding them that the permanent tribunal is open to them, and agrees with the Interparliamentary Conference in expressing 'the desire that the powers which signed the Hague Convention should, as far as practicable, agree to act in concert and in the most practical way to fulfill the engagement which Article 27 of the protocol lays upon them.'

"The Congress recommends as worthy of the consideration of the powers the Model Treaty presented to this Congress as the result of the study of the committees appointed for that purpose by the Peace Bureau in 1900 and the Peace Congress of 1901, having for its object to constitute an arbitral union of states and to insure that the beneficent initiative of the above Article 27 shall be carried into effect."

Mr. La Fontaine then said: Now a few words about what was said by Mrs. Lockwood. The question before you is to simplify the completion of arbitration treaties. As you know, there are about sixty-five states in the world, and if every one of these states makes arbitration conventions with all the others there must be sixty-four conventions with each state, or more than thirty-six hundred conventions. Now we want to simplify this, and to have one convention to which all the states in the world can agree. The Postal Union is an instance of this. Under it you can send a letter all over the world for five cents. There was only one treaty made in forming this Postal Union; it was made first by twenty states, and all the others came in afterwards. We think the same procedure must be used in the arbitration question; there must be first one convention between some of the states, and then all the other states come in.

This would simplify the whole question. We propose a scheme, which has been read by Mrs. Lockwood, that on the one side the powers will enforce Article 27 of the Hague Convention, and that every other state which has not signed may come in afterwards. As you know, there are now two general treaties, the treaty between Denmark and the Netherlands and the treaty signed in Mexico by the Pan-American Conference held there. But the two treaties are very short and do not give details enough for the organization of the Union. In the new scheme here before you the details are given; it shows where the new states will come in, which state is to have the presidency of the Union, and it is to the President that the new states that would come in shall write.

It is only a scheme, as you see. You do not adopt the scheme; you only propose that if a new general treaty is made by many states this scheme shall be followed as far as possible. I think that the Congress cannot do better than approve such a scheme, and ask the states to make one treaty which will form all the states into one Union, and so it will not be necessary to have as many treaties as there are states.

Mr. Pete Curran (representative of the General Federation of Trades Unions of Great Britain): *Mr. President and Fellow-Delegates:* As this is the first time that I have ventured to address the Congress, I will take the opportunity at the outset of conveying to the various nationalities represented here the heartiest good wishes of the Trade Unionists of the United Kingdom.

The Trade Union Congress held in Leeds three weeks ago, prior to my sailing for America, at which one million and a half of the organized workers of the United Kingdom were represented, in addition to giving me, by unanimous vote, credentials to come here and speak on their behalf, also passed a resolution of a very definite character, asking the powers to enter at once into an international understanding for the purpose of bringing about international peace. Therefore, you will clearly understand that while we represent a country that unfortunately has been overburdened with militarism, yet the organized workers of that country, though they are in a minority, are solidly in agreement with the aims of this great International Peace Congress.

There are three great powers which, in my estimation, ought to be kept in view by this Congress, especially in connection with the resolution which is before you. Each of the three powers have men at the head of affairs who have expressed their desire to establish international peace. I mean, in the first place, Russia, whose Czar is already pledged through the Hague Conference to the principles of peace. [Applause.] Well, I very much fear a great deal of pressure would have to be brought to bear on the Czar before he puts those principles into practice. [Applause.] We have also the present President of the United States, committed quite recently before the Interparliamentary Union to the same principle; and King Edward the Seventh, the monarch of Great Britain, who has shown very definitely a desire to join hands with the other powers of the world in bringing about international peace. In principle, as an adherent of socialism, I am of course against the principles of monarchy, but when King Edward as the monarch of our country is prepared to help us in establishing international peace, I am perfectly willing to take all assistance possible from that quarter.

In my judgment, if this Congress simply passes abstract resolutions and then lets matters alone entirely until the peace parties of the world assemble again, twelve months to come, we might as well, in my judgment, not assemble at all. We want to bring pressure to bear on the great powers of the world right here and now, and if we bring pressure to bear on the greater powers of the world, we believe that the smaller powers will willingly acquiesce in what the greater powers do.

I feel that there is a great principle underlying the peace movement which has not been very widely discussed at this convention up to the present moment. I do not blame the convention, because every question which has been brought forward has borne upon some aspect of the principle of peace. But we in Great Britain, especially the organized working class element, believe that the relations between capitalism and labor will have to be altered before we have peace assured. [Applause.]

All wars which have taken place for the last hundred years, irrespective of what nations were involved, were brought about distinctly because of the greed of territory. The greed of territory and the greed of imperial or colonial expansion are born of the greed of commercialism. [Applause.] And in my judgment and in the judgment of those whom I represent, until we are able within our own various territories to curb and to check that commercial greed we shall never be able to check this sordid greed of annexation which to-day overpowers so many of our statesmen. [Applause.] I believe that the great wealth producing class in the world will have to take this matter in hand and bring pressure to bear upon the great powers, and ask for absolute international disarmament.

THE CHAIRMAN: The audience will understand clearly that you are committed to nothing by adopting this resolution; it is simply a recommendatory resolution, and as such I think we all might agree to adopt it.

The resolution offered by Mr. La Fontaine was read again by the Secretary and unanimously adopted.

A report was then presented by Mr. Houzeau de Lehaie from Committee A on the condition of Armenia.

MR. HOUZEAU: *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I am glad as the chairman of Committee A to report on the condition of Armenia. I will be very short, for two reasons: the first one is that I don't know many English words; and the second one is that the unfortunate situation of Armenia is very well known to every one of you. So I will content myself with the very good speech of my friend, who is to address you, and with saying that peace between every class of men in one nation and peace between the different races in one nation is very important and is necessary as the basis of universal peace.

I will therefore simply read the resolution; I will read first in French and then in English. I think it is clear enough, and I need say nothing more.

Whereas, The situation in Armenia is growing worse and worse, and the massacres of the Armenian populations continue in the same atrocious way as heretofore;

Whereas, There is ground for protesting with the utmost energy against the apathy and inactivity of the European governments which allow these horrors to be continued without any serious or efficacious protestation;

Whereas, The reforms in Macedonia stipulated by the powers have not been sufficient to bring relief to the Balkan populations;

Seeing the international character of the Eastern question and the common responsibility of the great powers pledged by the terms of the Berlin treaty to intervene in the terrible situation created by the Turkish government;

The Congress respectfully appeals to the President of the United States to make use of the most appropriate means to put an end to the frightful sufferings of the various peoples of the Turkish empire, and suggests to him the idea of an international conference which shall endeavor to discover how it will be possible to put an end to the direct authority of the Sultan of Turkey over the peoples of foreign race which inhabit his empire, or to put his authority under some effective control.

DR. MELIKOFF of Armenia read an address in French, which was interpreted by Mr. Smith as follows:

Dr. Melikoff explains that the great massacres in Armenia of 1894 to 1896 cost the lives of some three hundred thousand Armenians, while many others were wounded and others starved to death, and he bases his declaration on the reports of diplomatic agents.

You will remember that in 1878 the Berlin Treaty was concluded, and in that treaty Article 61 especially recognizes the necessity of administrative reform in Armenia, and pledges the governments who entered into the treaty to see that these reforms should be applied. He attributes to this Article 61 of the Berlin Treaty the massacres that have been taking place in Armenia. This very Article which was meant to protect the Armenians has been the reason that has led the Sultan of Turkey to plan deliberately the scheme for exterminating the Armenian population, in order that there might be no necessity of carrying out the reforms proposed in the treaty.

There are two means of extermination. Occasionally you have the big, sensational massacres, such as those of 1894 and 1896. Then you have the normal massacres, that is to say, the apparently small massacres by which little districts are done away with in detail. The excuse for massacre is the difficulty of collecting taxes, or else it is a search made to try to find rebels that are supposed to come from foreign countries to disturb the peace of the Sublime Porte.

At one city this summer seven battalions were drawn up, twenty-four bridges were destroyed and a massacre took place, the people were tortured and seven thousand seven hundred and seventy-one of them were done to death, wounded or starved. He says that the same thing is now going on, and the paper of which he is editor, "Pro-Armenia," gives an account of news just received from Tiflis of further massacres taking place there.

These massacres are methodically organized. He does not blame Turkey or the Turkish people. He says that the Sultan governs absolutely; there is no Grand Vizier; there are no Cabinet Ministers; everything is managed by the Sultan, and his secret agents and spies permeate the whole country. The Sultan alone is responsible.

Dr. Melikoff claims that the European governments are also indirectly responsible in this matter, because they know perfectly well that they are pledged to intervene, and they have not done so, and they know it is this Berlin Treaty which encourages the Sultan to perpetrate these crimes.

This is a matter which is legitimately brought before this Congress, not on its own merits as an Armenian question, but because this Armenian situation is a focus of general disturbance. It represents a smouldering fire which at any moment may burst out and extend beyond the frontiers of Armenia. The danger that exists in Armenia is a danger to the peace of Europe, as well as a terrible menace to the Armenians themselves.

G. H. PERRIS: I have been commissioned by the Balkan Committee of London to bring before you under this resolution the question of Macedonia and those disturbed parts of southeastern Europe which are in a case hardly less serious and disgraceful than Armenia.

I shall not attempt to point out to you, as Dr. Melikoff has done, the shameful effusion of blood which takes place wherever the cursed rule of Abdul Hamed spreads itself. We have done too little to limit, to abolish these hateful cruelties.

I wish to say simply a word upon the practical question, because I believe that not only all in this building, but all in the civilized world, would arouse themselves if they could see what practically to do to help the peoples of Armenia and Macedonia.

Now I want to suggest to you that it is perfectly well known among statesmen what ought to be done. It is known, for instance, in regard to Macedonia, that all that is needed is that the reforms which have been pushed to a certain extent should be pushed still further; that the police force which is already officered by Russians and Germans should be international; that, above all, a European governor should be made responsible, because, while a Turkish governor is responsible, there is a perpetual collusion between the Turkish governor and the lower Turkish agents.

I might go on reciting these measures which are perfectly well understood, which could be applied to-morrow, so well are the details understood. Why are they not? Simply because the word "treasure" in this world is nearly always put before the word "humanity." In regard to treasure the European powers take precious good care that they rule the Turkish empire with complete success. I have traveled over the Turkish railways; the system runs as smoothly as your system here. There is no native traffic, there is only a traffic of soldiers, of Europeans and of officials — but it is ruled perfectly. Why? Because it is under European control in the name of European capital; because it is necessary always that profits be well paid whether the profits of humanity are paid or not. What about the Turkish tobacco monopoly? Its debts are paid to the moment. Humanity comes behind tobacco in the scale of human worth.

The Turkish public debt is administered thoroughly by European agents. Abdul Hamed has no hand upon the Turkish public debt, not a bit of it. It is like the administration of the Egyptian government by Lord Cromer, — he holds his hand upon the material goods of the Egyptian people, the first payment of whom is to be the payment of the debts of their recent conquerors.

I only have this practical word to say to you to-day: The time has come when the free peoples of the West should rise up and say that the debts of humanity shall be paid first, and the debts of capital afterwards. It is perfectly possible to-morrow, if in the Congress of the United States, in the Parliament of England, in the Parliament of France, in the Parliament of Italy — and I name these countries because more and more repeatedly in these last years they have approached each other in their policy — if in these countries the deputies stood up and insisted upon these reforms, we could get within two years the reforms in Macedonia which would secure at least that there should be safety of life, safety of transit and of movement, safety of conditions generally in this oppressed and suffering country. It lies with us to decide that our deputies shall say this in the parliaments, and I appeal to all of you to help us to get that done. [Applause.]

J. F. Green: There is just one thing that I think ought to be pointed out with regard to Armenia. I am in entire sympathy with and heartily support the resolution. Nobody who knows anything of what has been going on in Armenia for years past can do other than shudder with horror at the outrages perpetrated upon this unfortunate people. But I think it is only fair in this Congress to state the facts. A deliberate attempt, in my opinion, has been made to rouse the very worst passion that can be roused in this world, namely, the odium theologicum — theological hatred. An attempt has been made to arouse a hostile feeling on the part of Christians against Mohammedans, and to make out that it was only Mohammedans that would do this.

It is notorious that the government responsible for the empire of Russia would very much like to have the Armenian territory, which at present belongs to the Sultan of Turkey, but the Russian government would very much prefer to have Armenia without Armenians, and therefore the soldiers of the Czar, the Cossacks, are lending most efficient aid to the troops of the Sultan in putting an end to the Armenian people. The very last number of " Pro-Armenia " contains an illustration, the most terrible illustration which I have ever seen in any paper in the world. It is a representation of mutilated and slaughtered Armenians, not, mark you, by the emissaries of the Sultan of Turkey, but by the Cossacks employed by the Czar of Holy Russia. Emissaries of the Sultan on the one hand inform emissaries of the Czar when Armenians are to be driven over the frontier, and the Cossacks are there to receive them and give them a truly Cossack welcome. In the same way, when the Cossacks inform the Kurds that Armenians are to be driven across the frontier, the Kurds are there to give them a characteristic Kurdish welcome.

I do not want to take anything away from the blame which we are bound to throw upon the Sultan of Turkey, but at the same time it must be remembered that the men who are at the head of the Russian governmental system are directly responsible, to a great extent, for the massacres of these unfortunate Armenians. [Applause.]

Herbert Burrows: My friend, Mr. J. F. Green, has said a great deal of what I intended to say, but I want as an Englishman to enforce in the strongest possible way what Mr. Green has told you. I have had the opportunity of traveling in Turkey, and to some extent studying this Armenian question on the spot. I was within fifty miles once of the scene in which the most horrible massacres of the Armenians occurred a few years ago, and we found out two or three things there.

The first is that which Mr. Perris has told you, that in all these things, not only in the Armenian troubles, but in other similar occurrences, the trail of the financier is over all. The next is, as Mr.

Green told you, that the odium theologicum is also behind it; and the next, that everybody in these despotic governments is practically to blame for this sort of thing. [Applause.]

Now, like Mr. Green, I am in most hearty accord with the resolution, and I would not say one word which would detract from its effect, but I remember that the most despotic power in the world, the greatest menace to the peace of Europe, and the greatest menace to the liberties of the people, is the Russian government. [Applause.] I have worked for some five and twenty years, as I told Rabbi Levy yesterday, among the Jews in England, and I have been immeasurably surprised that at this Congress no mention has been made of the massacres of Jews in Russia. [Applause.] I took part in the agitation in London, among the poorer as well as the richer Jews, against that unspeakable massacre of the Jews by the Cossacks and the Russian government at Kishinef, and I say deliberately, knowing the facts, that there is not a pin to choose between the action of the Russian government and the action of the Sultan's government.

Now, let us go to the Armenians for a moment. It is true that there is the odium theologicum. We were told when we visited Constantinople, by a man who had been in Turkey thirty or more years, and who knows intimately all the ins and outs of the iniquities of the Turkish government, that when the awfulness of the Armenian massacres first began to dawn upon Europe, he made very careful inquiries, and he found that during the worst of those massacres the Sultan himself in his palace stood all night by the side of the operator at the telegraph instrument and personally ordered the massacres of those Armenians. His object is to clear out all the Christians from Turkey. That is the key to his policy. He wants Turkey for the Turkish, and he does not want any Christians there at all.

Well now, side by side with that, and intertwined with it, is the action of the Russian government. Now I do not blame the Turkish people for the setting Christian against Mohammedan or Mohammedan against Christian. We were not very long in Constantinople, but we were there long enough to find out that the ordinary Turk, the peasant especially, is a very peaceful fellow. He does not want to be interfered with, and he does not want to interfere with anybody. Until his passions are stirred up by his government, he can live quite peacefully in his villages and towns side by side with his Christian neighbors. But the Turkish government is not a government of civilized people.

The men who rule both governments, Russia and Turkey, are at bottom savages, veneered by art and ordinary commercial civilization. And until the powers of Europe wake up to say that not only in Armenia but in Russia shall massacres of unoffending people stop; and until the powers of Europe, and America also, tell our own British government that the massacres of unoffending people in Tibet shall stop [applause] — till you take the trail of savagery out of these governments, till you bring the pressure of the highest, not commercial, but religious and ethical civilization, to bear on these despotic governments,— our duty as a Peace Congress is not done.

My last word is that the duty of the Peace Congress is to put all such nations on the same footing in this respect; not to think that Russia is a heaven upon earth because the Czar called the Peace Conference; not to think that the Sultan is a double-dyed villain. Blame him, blame the Czar, blame us, but work to bring about that reign of justice and peace in the world, of which these governments till now have not had the slightest conception. [Applause.]

Dr. G. B. Clark: I am interested very much in this Turkish question, and during the past year I have visited both Turkish Armenia and Russian Armenia. I was rather biased in favor of Russian rule, because a large portion of Armenia is now a part of Russia; but to my astonishment I found among the Armenians in Russia as great a hatred of Russian rule as I found in Turkey of Turkish rule. In Turkish Armenia you find nothing but dirt and desolation, but in Russian Armenia you find almost as much civilization as here. Batu is almost as fine as Boston.

I am not going to defend Turkey. God forbid! But I know that Turkey exists only because of British policy. I know that the Crimean War which we fought was for the purpose of maintaining this horrible, this legalized anarchy over this country. Macedonia would have been a self-governing state, as well governed as Servia and Bosnia, had it not been for Great Britain. Turkey must end; but you must strike at the real source of her continuance: the real source is the policy of Great Britain. When Macedonia was liberated by Russia — and I was one of the old Macedonian Committee — Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury deliberately took from it that right and handed it back to Turkish misrule. [Applause.]

That is the position that we are in to-day. You may appeal to President Roosevelt to do something. President Roosevelt and the American people are guiltless. Appeal to the British government; appeal to the British people. And when you are doing it, I agree with my friend Mr. Perris that you should also appeal to them to stop their "peace" embassies. We send a "peaceful" embassy and it is suddenly changed into a great war embassy. We find a treaty under which we have taken Tibet, and the trail of the commercial serpent is there, because no foreigner has a right to mine or to have any property in Tibet.

Do not let us appeal to any outsider like the President of the United States, who is not responsible, and who can do little. Let us appeal to the British government to change its policy. [Applause.]

The Chairman: I had intended, without knowing I should occupy this position this morning, to say one or two words in regard to the resolution. They shall be very brief.

I want to point out one or two things. I respectfully submit to those who prepared this resolution for our consideration whether they think it is likely that any great conference of the powers would end the atrocities in Armenia. We have had conference after conference.

We have had one of the most powerful Prime Ministers in Europe throwing all his great influence into the scale in favor of the Sultan of Turkey, actively identifying himself, in fact, with the policy pursued by the Sultan. This Minister would be represented at the conference and would naturally exercise an enormous amount of influence, and we could not expect anything but discord and abortion from a conference of that kind.

I respectfully submit that we are asking the powers to do that which we know would be an absolute failure. Therefore it seems to me to be folly to expect the powers to do that which we know it would be folly to do. Great Britain, I think, is no worse than any of the others. They all have their little game to play, and they would play it in the conference the same as they are playing it at the present moment.

I cannot help thinking that if President Roosevelt were to take the step it would be the best way to settle the difficulty. I know the feeling of consternation produced in Great Britain and the danger that existed at that time, though it did not pass into the acute stage, when we received the message of President Cleveland in regard to Venezuela. There was a dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela that had existed for a century, and our statesmen told us over and over again it was impossible that that dispute could be settled. They were always ready to assign all sorts of reasons why that dispute could not be settled. President Cleveland, as you know, issued a peremptory message. We looked very much askance at it; we were very much annoyed that the President of the United States should issue a message of that kind, almost commanding Great Britain to settle that difficulty with Venezuela. Well, it was settled, and there is no doubt whatever that the settlement was due to President Cleveland and the message which he issued. [Applause.]

I admit the danger of such a course, but I cannot help thinking that if to-day President Roosevelt were to follow that example, and say to the Sultan of Turkey, not "Let us join you in a conference to consider this question," but "You have for generations outraged every principle of humanity; in the name of civilization and humanity we demand that these atrocities shall cease, and cease forthwith." In less than three months the Sultan of Turkey would be on his knees, the atrocities would cease, and they would never be recommenced.

I merely point that out for your consideration. It seems to me an unfortunate course to ask the powers of Europe to enact another farce — to join in a conference with a view to terminate that which we know would not be terminated as the result of any such conference.

I have nothing more to say except that I shall not as an individual member of the Congress oppose the resolution, but I venture to predict that if it is adopted the effort will prove abortive.

Dr. Trueblood: May I call Mr. Cremer's attention to the fact that it is an international conference which is contemplated, of which the United States, and not the European powers alone, should be a part? It is a very different thing from a European conference only.

Rev. Chas. G. Ames: I wish to give my reason for voting "No." I do not think the resolution is thoroughly matured so as to be a fair expression of the feeling of the Conference; and I think we are laying out too much work for the President of the United States right along.

Rev. Chas. F. Dole: May I ask from what committee this resolution came?

The Secretary: It came from the first committee, Committee A, on Current Questions.

Mr. Dole: Committee A? I have the honor to be on Committee A and I have never heard of this question before. I move the reference of the question back to the original committee.

The Chairman: Do I understand you to propose that the subject shall be referred back to the committee for further consideration?

Mr. Dole: Yes, sir; I am sure it cannot pass in the form in which it now appears.

Mr. Dole's motion was duly seconded, and the Congress unanimously voted that the report of the committee should be referred back to them for further consideration.

The Secretary read a reply just received to the greeting sent from the Congress to the Episcopal Convention in session in this city, as follows:

TO THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, convened in Boston, sends to the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, assembled in the same city, greetings and assurances of profound sympathy with the motive which has created the Congress and the work to which it is dedicated.

We believe that the deepest interests of the Church are identical with those of society; that spiritual forces underlie and coalesce with the intellectual, economic and political forces that are working the amelioration of humankind, its redemption from ancient wrongs and stupidities, the expansion and organization of its liberties; and we recognize in the International Peace Congress an instance of the illumination and momentum which these forces have acquired in the centuries that have been leavened by the truth and ideal of Christ.

While the struggle for existence is the law of a race or a nation, as it is the law of an individual, there is no reason why the savagery of war should not be eliminated from that struggle; no reason that can justify itself before the tribunals by which the world protects either its moral or its secular interests. There is no reason, moreover, why the methods which civilized nations have developed for the administration of justice and the adjustment of rival interests should not be applied to the relations of international life.

As the world is belted down and its racial stocks and governments come into more vital and complex touch, men are beginning to discern that war is a crude, brutal and wasteful method of adjusting the antagonisms of races and sovereignties. In this regard, as in many others, the principles of Christian morality are reinforced by the expanding needs of the world's industrial and commercial life.

Year by year, more eagerly and hopefully, the eyes of all who care for the well-being and onward march of humanity are turned to the Hague Tribunal of Arbitration as a power for righteousness, which is in the first chapter of its history.

There is that in its conception which, if realized, will establish a new ideal of international honor, which shall be based upon a new ideal of international justice.

This tribunal, however, or any other agency for the protection of the world from its false traditions and selfish greeds, can fulfill its mission only as it has behind it a vigorous and enlightened social conscience. This conscience we believe it is the province and the purpose of the International Peace Congress to educate.

We therefore, in the name and worship of the Prince of Peace, the Discoverer and, in a deep sense, the Founder of the human Brotherhood, assure our prayers and coöperation to the Peace Congress convened at an hour in which possibly the most gigantic and destructive war of history is giving terrible testimony to the need of a high court of nations and a parliament of the world.

Attest: HENRY AUSTIN,
Secretary.

The next order of business was the following report from the Committee on Propaganda, which was submitted by Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead:

First: Inasmuch as the first need of the peace propaganda is adequate funds to undertake a great campaign of education on the futility and evils of armed peace, the Congress recommends that far more strenuous efforts than have ever been employed shall at once be undertaken, so that the burden of the propaganda shall no longer rest on the weary shoulders of those who have only their leisure time to devote to it.

The Congress further recommends that a sum equal to the price of one first-class battleship — seven million dollars — shall be solicited from the civilized world, to be spent in the practical measures which are embodied in the following suggestions:

The establishment of a centre of propaganda in fourteen or fifteen of the world's great capitals, — Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, Tokio, Cairo, Buenos Ayres, etc., — with five hundred thousand dollars more or less to endow each and to give it a conspicuous headquarters. These centres should all be affiliated with existing peace societies and in harmonious relation with the Berne Bureau. They should be officered by men of large experience and ability in organizing, who, according to the need of each locality, should use the following agencies:

a. Books and leaflets in various languages sold at cost price and in attractive form. These should include such historical, economic, religious, sociological and scientific matter as will be useful in reaching all classes of citizens in a peace propaganda.

b. Syndicate articles for the press, especially when friction between nations is impending; and a press bureau which shall supply exact and impartial information as to the real attitude of one nation to another.

c. Illustrated lectures for workingmen, schools, churches and clubs on questions relating to peace and war.

d. School histories and readers revised and edited so as to minimize the records of military campaigns, and emphasize the advance of science, discovery and social progress.

e. The increase of membership in parliamentary arbitration groups by requests from constituents.

f. The enlistment of the intelligent coöperation of those organizations which promote religion and true patriotism and those which are working to remove artificial commercial barriers on frontiers.

g. Definite, concrete presentation of the economic evils of war by graphic methods which shall appeal to the passer-by, and offers of prizes for the best essays, books, poems, suitable for use in the propaganda.

In commenting on this part of the report MRS. MEAD said:

We have heard much of "the sinews of war"; it is high time that we heard something about the sinews of peace. [Applause.] If the peace of this world is to be achieved it must be by education, and education costs something. Seventy years ago there was just one man in the State of Massachusetts who had a million dollars; to-day there are said to be at least four hundred. There are twelve hundred people in the city of New York who are millionaires or multi-millionaires. Last week in Boston a lady of whom I had never heard died and left a million dollars for local charities. Last spring another, unknown to me, left a million dollars for a cathedral there. The other day in Philadelphia a man died and left fifty million dollars — I had never heard of him before. And so from day to day we find rich men of whom we had never heard dying and leaving enormous sums to various charities, but, strange to say, the men who know how to get money are singular in their ideas of spending it. They ring the changes on three or four things, — hospitals, libraries, schools. Now we do need all the money that has been given to hospitals, libraries and schools; but there are some things even more fundamental than some of these.

There have been two millionaires who have done great things for peace. We honor Mr. Andrew Carnegie because he gave a million and a half dollars for the Hague International Law Library and for a Temple of Peace; we honor him for giving five million dollars for the Heroes of Peace. We honor Mr. Nobel, who gave ten million dollars, the interest of one-fifth of which shall go to the peace propaganda. But the man whose gift touches our hearts most is the man sitting on the platform, who, when last year he received the Nobel prize of forty thousand dollars, turned over nearly all of it to the cause of arbitration. [Applause.] I refer of course to Mr. William Randall Cremer, M. P., who is presiding at this meeting, the founder of the Interparliamentary Union.

Is it not a disgrace to the rich men of this world to give so little when one sees a poor man give away to this great cause far more than he keeps for himself?

There are many others who at serious cost to themselves are doing valiant service. I, perhaps more than any American woman here, know how limited are the means of most of the peace workers on both sides of the Atlantic. These people are giving their time when they are weary, when they often pay for their own postage and stationery, and when paying even their own carfare they give free lectures. There is a man of small means whom I see in this audience, — I see him always at Mohonk at the Arbitration Conference, — who gives all his scanty leisure to sending syndicate articles on peace to a hundred newspapers. A little money would enable him to give all his valuable energies to the cause of arbitration. I refer to Mr. L. A. Maynard, whose name all ought to know.

The time of small things in this work ought to have passed. Millions upon millions are being put into this and that kind of charity and philanthropy which are mere palliatives and poultices on the evils created by armed peace and war. Why is it that we have so little money spent for peace? I believe it is because intelligent people have n't yet waked up to the fact that it is a really practical thing. There is no sentimentalism about our schemes; we know definitely what we want to do, and now we appeal for money to enable us to do it.

A battleship costs a sum more than equal to the valuation of all the land and all the ninety-four buildings of Harvard University, plus the valuation of all the land and buildings of Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes; and that battleship can in three minutes be turned into old junk, as was the "Maine" in Havana Harbor. If it is not destroyed its length of life for fighting purposes is only thirteen years.

We do not need to wait until we get our seven million dollars; we shall begin with the price of a torpedo boat or a Gatling gun. I want to live to see upon Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, upon the Strand in London, upon the *Unter den Linden* in Berlin, — upon the leading avenues of each of the great capitals of the world,— a well-equipped building which shall be the centre of propaganda. I believe that if we can assure the rich men of the world that we have this definite program, and we want them to start the fire which shall create steam and make the wheels go round — if we can make even a few of the privileged men of every land realize that, the money will be forthcoming. We must therefore be absolutely business-like in our methods and waste no time in anything that is unpractical.

We advocate "books and leaflets at cost price," such as Mr. Edwin Ginn provides at 29 Beacon Street in the International Library which he has begun to publish, consisting of the most important works in behalf of peace and arbitration. Bloch's "The Future of War," Charles Sumner's "Addresses on War," and Channing's "Discourses on War," have already been published in this series, and others are to follow. We want a great deal more of literature sold at cost price, and we want it in every important language.

We ask for "illustrated lectures," such as Professor Ruyssen of France has just told us are being used so widely in his country. We can have for fifteen cents apiece slides which illustrate every phase of the whole question.

The arbitration groups in the parliaments of the nations ought to be extended and increased. We ought to have every member of Congress, Senators and Representatives, members of this group. And so in other countries. What will persuade them to join? Your writing and asking them. The other day, one of the Kentucky Representatives, speaking of a certain measure under consideration, said: "Do you know, I have had twenty letters on that subject: the whole state is stirred up about it." See to it that you write a letter to your Representative and ask him if he belongs to the arbitration group, and if not, whether he will not join.

Then we should seek "the enlistment of the intelligent coöperation of those organizations which promote religion and true patriotism."

There has been so much bastard patriotism that we take pains to put in that word "true" patriotism.

Second: The committee recommends that at the present session no action shall be taken regarding a peace flag.

For several years at our Congresses the subject of a peace flag has been raised, but we feel that the vital questions we are considering to-day, — the Armenian question, the Macedonian question, the Japanese-Russian War, — are of such importance that it would be inexpedient to spend any time in discussing devices, forms and colors. For the same reason we ourselves cannot consider any details regarding a universal alphabet or language.

Third: That the requests which have been presented from different scholarly sources relating, in one case, to a universal alphabet, and in another to a universal language, be referred to the Berne Bureau with power either to act or to recommend action at a later Congress.

Fourth: That the kind invitation of the Peace Society at Lucerne, Switzerland, to hold the Fourteenth Congress at Lucerne in 1905, be accepted, and the arrangements for the Congress be entrusted to the Berne Bureau.

Fifth: The present Peace Congress recommends to the religious authorities of every land that each formulate a prayer, to be offered in their regular religious services, that God will enable the nations of the earth to settle peaceably all their disputes; and that the Berne Bureau be requested to convey this request to the proper authorities.

Sixth: In view of the increased demand among all people for reduced postal rates, the Congress recommends to the governments of the earth the adoption of an international two-cent postage stamp.

These are the recommendations which the committee makes.

MR. W. P. BYLES: I wish to add one practical suggestion to the many which Mrs. Mead has made from the platform. I am quite certain that every member of the Congress appreciates the services which Mrs. Mead has rendered in providing for our comfort and in promoting the great success of the Congress. [Applause.] I thank her for the many inspiring suggestions which were embodied in her speech.

But I want to add one suggestion as to these methods of propaganda, which Mrs. Mead in her modesty was precluded from making. This morning there came into my hands for the first time, and I hope it will be in the hands of many of you, "A Primer of the Peace Movement," published by the American Peace Society and written and prepared by Mrs. Mead. It is so excellent, as it appears to me, that I have asked for this moment to address you in order to recommend to every one of my colleagues at this Conference that before they leave Boston they should possess themselves of this Primer. Anybody who wants ammunition for speeches, who wants to understand the various arguments upon which the peace movement rests, or who wants to know how to set people thinking on this subject, will find abundant suggestion and most useful matter in this small pamphlet.

PROF. THEODORE RUYSSEN (interpreted by Mr. Smith): As a

French delegate he appeals to the Congress not to do again what has already been done. For instance, Mrs. Mead in her admirable report proposes that a fund be created for peace propaganda, but we must remember that at the Rouen Congress it was solemnly voted and provided that such a fund should be created. The fund is created; unfortunately there is not a dollar or a cent in that fund. [Laughter.] What you want now is to ask people to subscribe to the fund which was provided for at the Rouen Congress. It would be foolish to propose any figure, whether that of the cost of a battleship or of a torpedo boat; but we should be thankful for any subscriptions, whether large or small.

Then in regard to slides. There are actually two hundred and eighty such slides in existence. It is not necessary to say that these things should be done, they are done; there are two hundred and eighty slides at your disposal at the present moment, and you can obtain them either from the French Society of Peace or from the Berne Bureau. He has with him eighty photographs of those slides, so that you can see eighty of the two hundred and eighty subjects that are at your disposal at the present moment. Each of these slides costs fifteen cents.

Then again you have brought up the whole question of language. We have debated that at great length, and Professor Ruyssen was himself the reporter on the question at the Glasgow Congress. It was there decided to refer the matter to the society which had been formed for the special purpose of bringing about a universal language. Content yourself with doing what was done at Glasgow; that is, you approved of the principle, and now encourage by your approval those who are pushing that principle forward.

Then there are two points in Mrs. Mead's resolutions that are specially religious in tone; that is to say, Christian. Well, he does not object to those in any way, but he points out to you that the peace movement is also a "free thought" movement and a Masonic movement, and that while not objecting to any Christian sentiment that may be expressed, he wants it to be clearly understood that a large number of Freethinkers, Non-Christians and Free Masons are leading in the peace movement, and they reserve to themselves their independence of conscience and of thought. [Applause.]

HON. JOHN LUND: I desire to say a few words in regard to the peace prayer recommended by the Committee, as I had the honor to propose the subject for their consideration.

It is all but two thousand years since the Peace Prince of the world, Jesus Christ, preached the gospel of peace and the doctrine of love and goodwill among men.

How peacefully the so-called Christian societies have observed up to our day Christ's message and teaching it would be superfluous to dwell upon. Yet all this time every community throughout the world has raised its temple in honor of its Master, and assembles there for edification and prayer. And in Christian lands there are special prayers appointed, which the clergy in the name of the congregation are authorized to offer to the Lord of Lords; intercessions for the respective princes and governors and for "the forces by land and sea," etc., and these they repeat on each occasion that the congregation gathers to worship in the House of their God.

Has not the time come to introduce into the authorized prayers of the church a special petition also for peace and the work of peace? What great spiritual power would there not lie in one universal appeal to the Highest from all communities of the world, each time they assemble to worship, that the doctrine of the Master, "love one another," might be advanced to fulfillment among every people upon earth! The consciousness alone that at the same hour and with the same thought other races are turning in prayer to God for the maintenance of peace must strengthen and confirm us in our efforts.

A request from our Peace organization to all organized Christian societies throughout the world that they would support such a general church prayer would, I feel sure, in our times, when philanthropic ideas are daily gaining ground, be readily complied with. The continual recollection of the work we owe to peace which this would occasion, the general interest for the same which might thereby be aroused, would also certainly have its importance, and a stronger universal distaste for organized murder would thereby gradually make itself felt more and more.

Opinions as to how a prayer like this should be framed may be different. I make bold to suggest to you the following form:

> "Lord, give thou thy blessing to the work of peace we long to perform; grant that the disagreements between peoples upon earth may be settled peaceably, and strengthen thou all those who work for this thy cause with thy Holy Spirit's wisdom and grace. Amen."

Further, when trying to bring about some general prayer of this nature, we should not seek to confine it to the Christian world alone, for nearly all peoples put their trust in some Higher Being who directs their destiny, and to whom they turn themselves in prayer in times of gladness or of seriousness and in the hour of sorrow and of need. I venture to propose that the Peace Bureau, or a committee chosen by the present Congress, be authorized to draw up a proposal for some suitable form of common church prayer for the work of peace, and to make representations to the governments of the various lands or to the governing church boards with a view to getting the proposal furthered in the best possible way.

Mr. Edwin Ginn was then introduced and presented the following paper on

A SCHOOL OF PEACE.

From year to year the peoples of the civilized nations meet in convention to discuss the problems of peace and war. These conventions are exerting a good influence, yet the misfortunes of war are pressing upon us more heavily year by year. It would be difficult for any one to picture war in all its phases in stronger language than that used by Sumner in his "True Grandeur of Nations," or by Channing in his "Discourses on War," or by Bloch in his economic treatment of the subject. It is not lack of the knowledge of the horrors of war and the blessings of peace that retards our movement, but rather the indisposition of the people to grapple with the subject in a businesslike way.

The industrial organizations are developing the resources of the nations to a remarkable degree; but unfortunately a large part of this gain is lost in the expense of equipment for military purposes. Nationally we are all making good progress, — financially, economically, intellectually and morally; just laws have been established and obedience to them is secured through the courts. But internationally, in some respects, we are still barbarians of the Middle Age. The nations still rely upon the sword and the cannon for the protection of their rights. They are distrustful of each other. Occasionally they are willing to submit their differences to arbitration and settle them in accordance with the dictates of reason, but not a single nation is lessening in the slightest degree the physical force upon which it relies for its defense. The Hague Tribunal is a great step forward; but the peoples of the world in the main are not ready to submit their differences to this Court; and until the individuals who make up the nations are ready for such action, the heads of the governments will continue to be powerless.

There now exists among the civilized nations the most complete military organization the world has ever known, a force almost beyond our ability to comprehend. Five millions of the ablest-bodied men in the world are withdrawn largely from productive service, and their future, as regards salary and promotion, depends upon the present military régime. In addition to this maintenance of vast armies and navies, there is the enormous expense of establishing and equipping fortifications. All this imposes a frightful burden upon the rest of the community. To support this force and carry this burden the industrial world is hard at work, on the farm, in the shop, on the sea, in the counting-house, — in all the vocations for the real upbuilding of humanity; and after paying the enormous taxes imposed upon them because of these great armaments, there is left to many a very small margin for the absolute necessities of life. Mr. Atkinson has computed from government sources that each family of five people in this country pays for the expense of warfare twenty-five dollars a year.

To oppose all this, what are we doing? We have a few societies of well-disposed men; a few journals of limited circulation; a few noble men and women who are devoting their lives, so far as possible, to opening the eyes of their fellows to the evils of the present system; but the entire amount of money spent each year for these objects in our own country does not equal the expenditure upon one of our battleships.

Is it not time for us to look at existing conditions from a business standpoint? This thoroughly equipped and perfectly organized military force is the product of all the ages up to the present time. I am not denying its actual service in the preservation of order and peace. It is necessary to have a standing army, a militia and ships of war. We have not yet advanced to the period when it would be safe to dispense with them altogether. But do we need a force like the present? Would not a small regular army, with a militia for cases of emergency, and a few vessels of war, be ample for any nation to maintain for its protection in all civil dissensions or other dangers?

Any change in the existing order of things must be of slow growth, and it must be effected by education. In many countries the whole order of society needs to be changed. In Germany, for instance, and in many other countries, those connected with the army and navy stand socially at the very head, a place of honor to which the youth look forward with reverence and ambition. The children from the cradle are taught that the highest aim in life is to prepare themselves for the army. In our own country in some of our schools the boys are drilled like soldiers and march through the streets to the strains of martial music.

We need a body of educators whose sole duty should be to go among teachers, awakening and developing an intelligent and adequate interest in this great subject. This work of education should commence with the school children. It is with them that our greatest hope lies. We should remove from the books which are placed in their hands whatever would stimulate unduly the military spirit, and in its place tell them of the heroes in everyday life, who are sacrificing their lives in the investigation of the germs of disease and the methods of destroying them; draining unhealthy swamps; performing heroic deeds in saving the shipwrecked upon our shores; engaging in missionary work among the heathen and in our own land; brave firemen who, at the risk of their own lives, are saving the lives and property of others; the men and women working in the slums of our great cities, and depicting the misery they find there in order to awaken public interest so that these conditions may be improved; the trained nurses, who watch by the sick bed night and day, tireless in their efforts to relieve pain and to give comfort to the suffering; teachers in overcrowded schoolrooms, whose burden of responsibility and care knows no limit. No man upon the battlefield deserves higher enconiums than these unselfish workers. And yet I would not detract in the slightest degree from the honors that are paid to the noble men who have sacrificed their lives for their country; but I do object to the system which calls for the sacrifice of so many noble men. There are as many noble men sacrificed upon the wrong side as upon the right. It is the system that I deprecate. These men are noble, not because of war, but in spite of its demoralizing influences. It is the work which one engages in which must needs exert a constant influence upon the life; and the nobler the work, the nobler the life. Very little inspiration can come to any human being whose whole life is spent in preparation for the destruction of his fellows.

Then, too, we need a corps of workers who should devote their time to the press. The press is the greatest influence in the state to-day; and it is of the utmost importance that its tone upon this momentous question be raised to the highest level. At one time it seemed to me that an ably edited journal of the highest class, with a sufficient fund at its disposal, devoted exclusively to peace and arbitration, would perhaps be the most effective instrument in our crusade; but the more I study the matter, the stronger is my conviction that a special journal of this kind would not be so potent for good as a Bureau of Information, properly organized and conducted, which should furnish important articles to the leading papers. Comparatively few people would be interested in any journal which was devoted entirely to this subject; but the millions will read a well-written article in the daily press. People desire information; and I am satisfied that the most important service to our cause could be rendered, not through any one organ, even were it the best in the world, but through the great body of kindly disposed newspapers, the Bureau supplying, judiciously, such material as would best serve our ends. There should be in every community a very able editor, with suitable assistants, whose duty it should be to gather and distribute this material, — one in close touch with the leading papers and writers of the day.

Again, the clergy need to be awakened in much fuller measure to their duties and responsibilities for existing conditions. We should secure some of the ablest representatives of the pulpit and make it possible for them to devote the rest of their lives to going among and corresponding with their brother ministers, arousing enthusiasm in this great cause.

We also need the services of some of our ablest statesmen and lawyers, whose special task it should be to work among the legislators all over the land, those who have influence upon public opinion.

We are spending this year upon the army, navy, fortifications, etc., in this country, two hundred million dollars. Since 1790 we have spent not less than five thousand million dollars. The yearly expenditure of the civilized world for these purposes at the present time is about twelve hundred millions and has been over one thousand millions a year for the last fifteen years.

If one-half this amount were devoted to the upbuilding of society, it would establish a thorough system of graded highways; it would connect all the great river-systems for purposes of commerce; it would irrigate and make fruitful the immense tracts of sandy deserts throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world; it would eliminate the congested sections in our great cities, and in the place of crowded tenement houses, unfit for human beings to live in, provide comfortable homes at moderate cost; it would make possible a careful supervision of all the great mining industries, reducing the fearful loss of life to a minimum; it would build hundreds of floating hospitals for the sick during the summer months; it would found permanent hospitals wherever needed; it would establish a thousand farms and workshops near the great centres of population, where the unfortunate could have employment at a small remuneration, until such time as they could help themselves; it would establish a paid commission in every country, which should give its entire time to the study of the different problems connected with the various industries of the day and aid in the solution of these most perplexing questions; it would provide schools in every neglected portion of the globe, and in many other ways improve the physical, intellectual and moral conditions the world over.

Is not our loudest call to give more attention to the consideration of ways and means for beginning immediately a vigorous and systematic *campaign of education* against the present warlike tendencies of the nations and against the false ideas as to what really makes a people great? The same law governs nations as individuals. Do we regard as our greatest men those who possess the most land, houses, ships, stores, railroads or other property? Is it not rather the man, though he possess little of this world's goods, of high moral worth and broad intelligence, whose judgment is safe to guide the people aright? Shall we not extol the nations who rule their subjects wisely, giving to each protection in his individual rights, rather than those who extend their dominions by conquering a weaker people and taking from them their liberties?

It seems to me that we have arrived at a stage beyond the talking period, and should now take up this subject in a businesslike way, making use of all the good things that have been said as a lever to produce results. It is not sufficient to spend one or two days in the year discussing this subject. It is not sufficient to publish a few journals of limited circulation. It is not sufficient that a few men and women are giving their lives to this work. We must educate the masses. It is constructive, not destructive, work that will improve the nations. Russia and Japan, in a single year, will destroy more than a century can restore, to say nothing of the suffering in the homes, on the battlefield and in the camp. Perhaps this frightful loss of life and property and the misery inflicted upon these two nations, and, in fact, upon the whole world, may be the culminating lesson to turn the nations to wiser methods of settling their differences.

The meeting together of representatives from all over the civilized world offers a very great opportunity for studying and improving present conditions, but are we making the most of these opportunities? Is not our circle of influence too limited, our work temporary and intermittent? All these eloquent speeches reach only a few thousand people and the press reports are but meagre. When the week is over we shall return to our homes, take up our accustomed duties, and the noble work here discussed will soon be forgotten in the engrossing cares of the world. We need a permanent, persistent force, to take advantage of the enthusiasms aroused here, and by printing and spreading broadcast these speeches keep the cause alive. Constant agitation will be necessary for many years to educate the people to demand a less expensive and more reasonable method of conducting international relations. No solution of this most difficult problem is possible unless it be undertaken by broad-minded men who are ready to ignore boundary lines and all thought of nationality, seeking only the highest good for all.

Before I close permit me to throw out a hint, for the consideration of business men, in regard to the foundation of an organization which might properly be called " A School of Peace."

In the first place, a Board of Trustees should be selected from those who have shown great originality and executive ability in carrying on large business enterprises. To their hands should be committed the duty of choosing the ablest men in the country who desire to devote their lives to the study and promotion of this most important of all questions. They should carefully consider the conditions of the whole world and the relation of each nation to it, in order to inaugurate a working scheme that shall be just to all. They should also be competent to select the most efficient assistants to join with them in this great undertaking.

To establish and equip this " School of Peace " on broad and lasting foundations a large endowment is necessary. If anything is to be accomplished in this world, of either great or small moment, some one must *do* something. Talking is all very well, but I have yet to see a crop of wheat gathered from the field, a bridge span the river, a ship launched into the sea, or a railroad cross the continent, by mere *talking*. Some one must put his hand to the work, or furnish the funds for other hands, in all undertakings, else they will fail. Moral influence is good, but if that is our sole reliance, this cause will not be advanced. Until this moral influence is quickened into *action*, little will be accomplished.

Many intelligent people have said to me, " The plan which you propose is too broad, too far-reaching, to hope for any immediate results." That is true, but immediate results are not what we are looking for. Every peace-loving citizen should do all he can to promote the cause of arbitration in the settlement of all disputes, but at the same time he should attempt to remove the causes of contention, and is not the greatest cause of international complications the vast armaments of the world ? We recognized this principle when we established a law to prevent the carrying of firearms by citizens. It is the well armed man, prepared for a quarrel, who is most ready to seize the first occasion for engaging in one ; and as with the individual, so it is with the nation.

I have given a great deal of thought to this most important question of disarmament. Of course no plan can succeed which is not based to a large extent upon present conditions. Each nation would expect the same armament, relatively, as now exists, and with good reason. It is not alone the population that should regulate the force allowed a nation; but taken in connection with that, the comparative wealth of a nation is a very important and vital consideration. For example, suppose two nations were equal in population, but one possessed three times the wealth of the other, then equitably she should be allowed three times the force. This would simply be following out the natural laws of development, as the richer nation could maintain the larger armament as easily as the other could the smaller force. If all could agree upon some such plan, the present armed force could be reduced very materially — perhaps one-half in the near future.

Perhaps the next most important step to be taken would be the calling of a convention, not of politicians or envoys seeking first the advancement of their own people, but of the greatest men in all the world, who should meet together as a Congress of Nations, to devise better plans for coöperation in the world's work. The relations of the individuals in the different countries are much closer than those of the states themselves; and when the individuals of the nations shall meet in convention some practical, working plan will surely be evolved for reducing this vast expenditure of life and treasure.

The whole world has so long depended upon physical force to maintain proper relations among the nations that a change to an economical, moral and reasonable plan for the settlement of differences must needs be slow. We may not expect to perfect the ideal organization in a day or a year. The great object with us all should be to make a real beginning toward lessening the armaments of the nations. This work cannot be done by one or two men; but we can lay the corner-stone. All great enterprises must have a beginning. Often that beginning is so insignificant as hardly to attract attention; but it is in the providence of the All-Wise that no good thought or act shall fail. We are asked simply to put forth what strength we possess. The final solution of the problem we may safely leave to the Father of us all. His laws will carry on the work, for He has ordered that good seed shall not die. Some may fall in barren places by the wayside; but enough will find fruitful soil and grow, until the face of the earth shall yield its own rich harvest of good overcoming evil, when man shall no longer desire to overreach or injure his brother, but all shall join in the grand old anthem, "Peace on earth, goodwill to men."

The report of Committee C as presented by Mrs. Mead was then approved.

The Chairman announced that Dr. Darby was ready to submit an amended resolution from his committee on the subject of Armenia.

DR. DARBY: We withdraw from the resolution as we now present it the request to President Roosevelt. That happy thought which occurred at the beginning when this report was made has been overdone, and we withdraw it.

We also omit any suggestion as to the course to be adopted in dealing with the evil. The resolution that we offer to the Congress, after some considerable thought, will therefore read as follows:

> *Whereas*, The situation in Armenia seems to be growing worse, and the atrocious massacres of the population continue;

Whereas, The reforms planned by the powers for Macedonia have not sufficed to secure the pacification of the country;

Considering the international character of the Eastern Question and the common responsibility of the great powers under the Berlin Treaty for the terrible situation there created;

This Congress appeals to the governments of Europe and the United States immediately to consider the best means of putting an end to the sufferings of alien populations in the Turkish empire, and of restricting or ending the direct rule of the Sultan over such populations.

This amended resolution was adopted unanimously, and the Congress adjourned.

Public Meeting in Park Street Church.

Friday Afternoon, October 7, 1904.

THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF RACES, AND THE MENACE TO THE WORLD'S ORDER THROUGH THE EXPLOITATION OF WEAKER PEOPLES.

The Rev. Charles F. Dole of Jamaica Plain called the meeting to order at 2 o'clock and said:

We have come together to-day to consider one of the most important and difficult subjects that is before the world. It is really, if people would think of it properly, the old issue of slavery over again in a new and subtler and more wholesale form. It is the old issue between aristocracy and democracy, between the stronger and the weaker people.

We thought we had settled the question once for all when we put an end to American slavery, but here it is again with us, — the same old issue. We trust that we have learned the lesson that came to us out of the question of slavery, but the very point of all our discussion is whether we have learned the lesson. The same plausibility that is involved to-day in the relation between the stronger and the weaker peoples was involved in the old days between the stronger and the weaker individual. Nobody in the old Greek period ever thought that it would be possible to abolish slavery. There were men born to be slaves, as there were other men born to be free. That is what the old Greeks thought. And as late as the time of the organization of our government, Washington was fairly puzzled to see what was to become of these weaker individuals (slaves) unless some stronger and more energetic people took charge of them. The question was, whether you could not take charge of them so justly that it would be better for them to serve as slaves than to live as free men. When people traveling in the South observed the contented condition of the slaves on the better plantations, they came back and reported that slavery was a good thing; and then they were always telling us that we could Christianize the weaker people if we only took care of them.

Now we have this question on, on a vast scale, all over the world, — in the English colonies, in Java, where the Dutch rule, all through Africa in reference to various great powers, the Belgians and the Germans and the English again. It has been on in a rather small way between our own government and the Indian tribes, and we have found difficulty enough, and have written the story of our "Century of Dishonor" about it. The world has not, however, yet got the lesson, and the process of the exploitation of the weaker races, so enormous do the commercial powers grow, is going forward on a scale vaster than ever before. We have come together to consider what we can do about this question, and whether we can set in motion any moral and spiritual and political forces which shall serve to check this colossal danger which faces the world.

We got rid of slavery only after a fearful war and the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of men. Shall we get rid of the other forms of the evil in the same way, or shall we, learning by experience, take a saner way of disposing of them? Shall we believe what we say we believe about the democracy of man? Shall we believe that men are our brothers, whatever the color of their skin may be? That is the precise question before the world. There are multitudes who tell us that they do not believe it at all. They tell us the only way we can manage for the weaker and the inferior people, as they call them, is for the stronger people (that is, we) to take them in hand. And they say, pointing to superficial results,—precisely as in the old days people pointed to the picturesque results on a great Virginia plantation, — they say, "See how beneficent in India and in Java this kind of rule is." At the same time things are going on all over the world that make one's heart sick. I am afraid we have got to hear some of those things this very afternoon.

But first, we are going to listen to one, a great authority on all these matters of race difference and race value,— for I do like to change the word and say "race value" rather than "race difference," — I mean President G. Stanley Hall of Clark University, our fellow citizen of Worcester.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT G. STANLEY HALL.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Some of you have no doubt seen in the Smithsonian Museum at Washington a large picture by an artist whose name I forget, entitled "The Extermination of the Buffalo." It pictures a hunter well supplied with ammunition, hidden on a high rock, and shooting down the buffalo. Underneath the picture is this legend: "This shows the method by which the great Northern and the great Southern herds in this country, numbering nine million at least, were exterminated between 1872 and 1883." Precisely that process has been going on with regard to all the higher animals ever since the dawn of civilization, and never so rapidly as now. All our game protection laws are ineffective, and the journals devoted to natural history contain every little while lists of new animals that have been exterminated.

Now it is just this process that is going on with regard to the lower races of mankind to-day. Man, it is said, cannot trace his origin because of certain "missing links," but it is man himself who has exterminated these "missing links," kicked over, as it were, the ladder by which he rose, or exterminated his own genealogical tree. [Applause.]

In all the one hundred and thirty-six colonies and dependencies of the world, which embrace to-day just about one-third of the human race and two-fifths of the entire globe surface, this process is going on by very many means, by disease, sometimes by starvation, sometimes by discouragement, sometimes by conscious and deliberate annihilation. And this has actually become, in the minds of a few writers, a deliberate gospel. They have attempted to apply Professor Darwin's theory to the realm of man.

We have had a great many concrete instances of this. You have all read, no doubt, the story of the Indians in the eastern part of British America, the only surviving cave men. Only in 1835 the very last member of this interesting tribe died and took out of the world with her their traditions and customs. They had not even been civilized. Such is the story of the Tasmanians also, estimated all the way from forty to four hundred and fifty thousand. They were a race of unique origin and of peculiar qualities of body and of mind. It was said by those who first discovered them, when Tasman landed there early in the seventeenth century, that they were men and women of great vigor and virtue. And first of all they committed that greatest of all offenses — they showed that they had land that was precious and that there were certain minerals there. That is the death sentence of a primitive race. So they were crowded out of the more valuable territory. A great many of the settlers actually kept tally on their gun stocks of the number of natives they had killed. Finally they were banished to Flinders Island. One or two were taken to England and educated, and within the memory of men now living the very last survivor of that great race died of the white man's dissipation and the white man's disease. They departed without leaving any trace in the world, and their blood cries to-day from the ground.

That process is going on almost everywhere where the so-called civilized and primitive races come in close contact with each other. They are dying by various processes — by disease, for instance. You know that to primitive people who have not had the measles that disease is as fatal as the smallpox is to us. In many of these primitive races, for instance, that of the Sandwich Islands, thousands have died of the measles. In fact I believe twenty or thirty thousand died of this disease in the Sandwich Islands alone. Moreover, the white man takes his " fire water " with him, and very often it happens that the very worst products of civilization are brought in contact with the best products of savage life.

No matter where you look you find this contempt of the white man for all aborigines. He feels that we are the best, and that the brown man and the red man and the yellow man must get out of the way of civilization ; that they must either accept "the white man's burden" or else be crushed to the earth by it.

There is no time to speak of details. It would be interesting to take up the general statistics of a great many lands, such as, for instance, New Zealand, which is supposed to contain to-day not one-eighth of the population which it contained when it was first discovered. It was that land which, you know, Macaulay pictured in an iridescent dream would some time or other in the future send one of its natives, who would go and sit on the ruins of London Bridge and wonder what on earth the English civilization really meant. And yet these people, the Maori, are now being rapidly extinguished, not, of course, by deliberate murder, but because they lose heart and soul. The story of "The Last of the Mohicans" is being repeated everywhere.

Now the fundamental assumption on which this all rests is wrong. It is not demonstrated that civilization is the last and the best thing in history. In fact a great many anthropologists, Huxley and many others, have shown us conclusively that first of all only a few of the brain cells are developed, and therefore the possibilities of the brain are not developed. Moreover, civilization only brings a certain few qualities into the foreground. It is well compared to a rich and many-roomed mansion, in one or two of which, perhaps, there is a dim light burning, all the rest being obscure.

There is, then, such a thing as the fanaticism of civilization that is almost comparable, I believe, to the fanaticism of the Mahdi himself. These primitive races, some of them, are decadent; some of them have passed their prime and are no doubt doomed by the inevitable laws of God to extinction; but some of them are extant and have their future before them.

A professor in the university of Berlin, in a book which he has written, says, naming several races in a great tribe in Africa, that it is his deliberate belief that these men have shown just such ability as Alfred the Great, and that we are regarding those people very much as the Romans, for instance, regarded the half-savage Briton in the days of Alfred the Great, or, indeed, as they regarded the German in the days of Tacitus.

Take the very best case, — for I have no time to dwell upon details, — take the very best case, that is, the British in India. Here are about fifteen hundred men in black, the officials, and about sixty-five hundred men in red, the soldiers, holding in awe and control a vast population of three hundred millions or thereabouts. And England has done in India this immense thing, — she has taught these warring tribes to respect justice, she has enforced peace and order, and is beginning to plant the seeds of Western civilization. But Europe never has understood, never can understand Asia. I believe that is a cardinal principle in the philosophy of history. [Applause.] And not only that, but we find that the great evil of all this thing is that, in the opinion of Mr. Digby and many other of the best authorities, India is less able every decade to govern herself instead of being more so. The dream of English statesmanship, that it is preparing India to govern herself, must, therefore, be declared in the light of the facts to be fundamentally unrealizable. On the other hand, the evil side of all this effort is seen in the excessive taxation; from thirteen to forty-six per cent. is the rate of taxation all over India, as shown by the Blue Book. In fact the tax is laid in many colonies upon the very rag about the loins of the peasant; in one case there was a tax of over four hundred per cent. on salt, and in another case of over six hundred per cent. on soap. We preach by our missionaries the virtues of cleanliness, and tax soap six hundred per cent! [Laughter.]

Take, for instance, the famine fund. Where is it? has been asked over and over again. By the very best statistics we have it demonstrated that in the last quarter of a century there were as many famines probably as in the first three quarters of the last century, and twenty-six millions have died like flies, partly because it was thought necessary to supersede the old law of Manu that required that money should be laid up every full year for the lean year.

The general principle seems to be this, that it may be after all that our civilization, like every other that the world has seen, is to have its day and slowly decline. There is no assurance that what we call the best or the truest thing has yet been so attained that it can never be lost. We must never forget that history is not yet written, because the best things have not happened yet. They are yet to occur. If man is in the process of making it would not be strange, but rather the thing that should be expected from every large and philosophic view of history, that by and by some race now obscure should take up the burden of civilization, light their torches, treat us sometime in the far future as we treat Greece and Rome and Babylon and the other great races of the earth, and gathering up the best of our lessons carry civilization on in a higher and broader way. Hence this suppression everywhere of primitive man, simply because he lacks firearms and because he lacks trade, is the thing against which, it seems to me, every Peace Congress ought to make its voice heard.

There are such things as studies of colonization that are beginning to be recognized. There is such a thing as preaching a religion that shall do for Buddhism, Confucianism, yes, even for the lowest forms of Paganism, something like what Jesus did for Judaism, simply reveal the best that is concealed in them and bring a higher civilization. If we are ever able to develop the ideal missionary, he will make himself sure that he is not ignorant of the best ideals of the religions of those among whom he goes, and his best ideal will be to do for them a work very similar to that which Jesus did for the Jewish religion.

That is the view which is beginning to claim the attention of those who are interested in the philosophy of religion from the point of view of the education of races. These primitive races must be regarded as children: to work them is child labor on a large scale, to oppress them is cruelty to children; but to educate and nurture them, to bring out the best in them — that is the goal toward which I believe our policy should steer. And I am optimistic enough to believe, in spite of all the tragedies of the present, that that is to be the tendency ultimately. [Great applause.]

The Chairman: I am now going to call upon Mr. E. D. Morel of England, who represents the Congo Reform Association, and you will be glad to listen to him.

ADDRESS OF MR. E. D. MOREL.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I think it is only fair and right, for the sake of the cause which I represent, to correct, or at any rate to comment upon, some statements which have recently appeared. I stand before you to-day a very feeble representative, not only of the Congo Reform Association, but of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, the Aborigines Protection Society and other societies, and I may claim fairly to represent the great and growing British public opinion which has interested itself in the Congo matter. Therefore, if my words have any effect upon you to-day, they are not the words of an individual alone, but of an individual speaking by the authority of a great many people and a great many powerful organizations.

The reason of my presence here is a very simple one. It is to appeal to you who are met here in the cause of peace to lend a helping hand, by your influence, to stop the cruel and desolating wars which for the last decade have been waged in the Congo in the name of philanthropy and civilization; to ask you whether you will not lend your influence to an effort to stop the systematic extirpating of a whole people for the sake of monetary gain.

You are, no doubt, most of you, acquainted with specific reports of atrocities and cruelties perpetrated upon the natives of the Congo.

For the last eight years and more,— for the last eight years more particularly,— we have had a stream of reports from the Congo of the same uniform character. Some of you who have looked into these matters may have thought that these reported acts were simply individual results of individual cruelty and wrong. Now what we contend is that the system that has been set up in the Congo territories makes these acts inevitable and necessary for the upkeep and maintenance of the system; and our whole case is based, not upon individual acts of wrong doing, but upon the system which makes those acts necessary to its maintenance.

Allow me to remind you of the circumstances under which international recognition was granted to what is now called the Congo Free State. When Stanley emerged from the mouth of the Congo, King Leopold of Belgium, who had founded an association for the exploration and civilization of Central Africa, hastened to come in touch with the great explorer. The upshot was that King Leopold's Association became a huge scheme which was to insure the neutrality of the Congo Valley, to promote therein the legitimate trade of all nations, and to promote a policy at once sound and statesmanlike towards the native inhabitants of the country.

On that basis King Leopold applied to the civilized world for recognition. He asked that the flag of his Association should be regarded as that of a friendly government. The United States, ever generous, was the first to translate into substance the belief which it had in the pretentions and the pledges given by King Leopold, and in 1884 first among the civilized powers recognized the flag of the Congo Association as that of a friendly government. Other powers followed, and the act of Berlin crowned the work.

In that way were the destinies of twenty million people and a huge territory in Africa, one and a half million square miles, handed over and assigned in trust to the King of the Belgians, not to the Belgian government, but to King Leopold personally. This great act, this resolution of such tremendous import to so many millions of human beings, was not made in lightness of heart, was not undertaken without a very clear understanding between the parties concerned.

What was the position of King Leopold's International Association before the recognition of that Association by the United States? There is no doubt that the expeditions which King Leopold sent into Africa between 1879 and 1884 had no legal status; failing recognition by the powers they were purely filibustering raids. In fact, Mr. Casson, the American Ambassador in Brussels and one of the American delegates to Berlin, described the occupation of the Congo country in the following words: "Without our recognition these efforts to civilize the Central African native, which we believe to be worthy of our support, must be held to be mere acts of piracy." It was solely and wholly on the strength of the specific pledges given by King Leopold that civilization recognized his association as that of a friendly and neutral state.

Those pledges are incorporated in the treaty between the United States and the International Association, and in the various protocols, and in the clauses of the act of the Conference of Berlin. Perhaps their essence can be concisely given in the following sentences of one of the plenipotentiaries at that Conference: "The natives would understand that civilization and government by white men meant for them peace and liberty."

"Peace and liberty," — I beg you to note those words. For twenty years the era of peace and liberty, of moral and material regeneration, has held unfettered sway in the Congo basin. For twenty years those modern crusaders of civilization in Central Africa have had their way. The dawn has broken. A light has risen slowly but clear. What picture does it reveal? It reveals a picture of great activity: a railway between the lower and upper Congo has been constructed; ocean steamers now go up two hundred miles; the upper river has enormous steamboats, very finely built; stations have been built, which I am told are surrounded by very beautiful cabbage gardens; there is a library in the capital — there is also a prison. There are various other concomitants of outward civilization. That is one side.

But what lies behind that? A stricken and oppressed race groaning under a yoke greater than that of the Ten Plagues of Egypt; a people oppressed from the first day of the year to the end of it. The pledges of the Congo State which was dedicated to liberty have been translated by making free with everything the native possesses, including his body and his life. The pledges of King Leopold have been translated by declaring his unquestioned personal right to every object of commercial value which their country produces. An army, greater than the armies of England, France and Germany in western Africa combined, has been raised and is quartered upon the population. A vast system of forced labor in India rubber and in food stuffs for the upkeep of the army and the stations has been inaugurated, and the people are dying out. There is a penal settlement in every village. There is a stockade of the soldiers, with instructions that that village must produce so much rubber per week or per fortnight, as the case may be. They have full license to oppress and to punish. And I ask you what, even if you had no reports from a dozen sources — I ask you what you would judge must be the inevitable result of such an abominable system?

When this demand for rubber, rubber, rubber is the one end and aim of the administration of the Congo Free State, from top to bottom, it is of no use to tell us that we are inventing these things. They have been published, and they have been published in the Belgium parliament. From every part of the Congo comes the same wearisome, mournful tale, of tribes dying out, large towns and villages disappearing, large areas extirpated of every vestige of human life.

And this insensate policy has not even religious fanaticism to excuse it. Its only fanaticism is the fanaticism of dividends. [Applause.]

Remember that we bring no charge against the Belgian government and the Belgian people. The Belgian government through its head, through its Minister for Foreign Affairs, has declared on two occasions within the last three years in categorical terms that the Congo State is a foreign state to Belgium, that Belgium has no *locus standi* with which even to force an inquiry upon the performances of King Leopold's personal rule in Africa.

You are being told that in criticising the results of that personal rule we are attacking a small and friendly nation. That is a false issue, false to the core, and known to be false by those who make it and try to cloak the result of their evil deeds behind the cry of Belgian patriotism.

It is against this wrong that we in England have been agitating, moving and protesting now for eight years. If the truth, perhaps, has come to us sooner than to others, it is because from our great knowledge of tropical African peoples and the dealings of Europeans with them we know that the European can only be in tropical Africa in one of two relations with the black man. He must either be the man of commerce, willing to give a fair wage for labor done, desirous at once to enrich the people whom he trades with and the home manufacturer; or he must devote himself to the system of ruthless and pitiless force which digs the grave of African happiness and the ultimate grave of every legitimate European enterprise in Africa — but which enables men to get rich very quickly.

The growth of the movement in England — and, I am happy to say, also on the continent of Europe — is a matter with which you are familiar. It takes a long time to move the governments of this world; it does not take quite so long to raise the people, and we believe that the minds and the hearts of the people of the world are beginning to be receptive to this abominable story.

I have had the honor to present a memorial to President Roosevelt signed by some of the greatest names in England — men who, you are told, are interested in promoting the selfish interests of British merchants — John Morley, Lord Aberdeen, the men who have always been foremost in every great movement of emancipation and of liberation of modern times. These are the men who, you are told, are working in the interest of a few British merchants! In appealing, as I am doing, to the American government and the American people, I am appealing to those who primarily, and of course unwittingly, riveted the chains about these Congo people's necks. If our duty is clear, — and we recognize it, — surely your duty is clear also. We are fighting a great and organized machine with the king as its managing director, with wealth untold with which to buy newspapers and manufacture public opinion.

And again, they are even raising the cry of the *odium theologicum.* I have read with sorrow in to-day's paper a letter from a very eminent, independent and deservedly respected prelate. I regret that letter. I feel sure the writer will regret it later on. When the writer of that letter has looked into the facts for himself, he will come to the conclusion that something more is needed to meet the charges which civilization is bringing against King Leopold than quotations from speeches respectively twenty and eight years old.

As for us, we are content to endure the calumnies and the reproaches which are heaped upon us. In the words of one of the greatest of Americans, Abraham Lincoln, "Let us have faith that the right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: Permission has been asked of the management of this meeting, and has been granted, to have as a speaker Mr. George Herbert Head of Cambridge University, who, I understand, wishes to present another aspect of the case from that which has just been given you.

ADDRESS OF MR. GEORGE HERBERT HEAD.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I desire first of all, in rising to address this meeting, to express my thanks on behalf of that large society in Belgium which I represent for an opportunity of speaking to you this afternoon.

You have been told about popular opinion in England. It has been suggested to you that practically the whole of England is behind the Congo Reform Association. That, ladies and gentlemen, is not correct. You may be interested to know that if there is an association which has been formed in England to deal with this Congo question, so there has been formed in Belgium a society very much greater for the defense of the Congo interests. Do you imagine for a moment that the people of England know more about the administration of the Congo than the Belgians do themselves? It has been said here by Mr. Morel that politically speaking there is no connection at present between Belgium and the Congo. That is true, politically speaking. But Belgium has poured her money into the Congo; she has spent not only money, she has given of the best of her citizens for the development of that state; and do you imagine that those Belgian men who go out to live and work in the Congo, and then come back to live amongst the Belgians — a civilized people who have done so much for the world's advancement — do you imagine that they are going to be able to live in Belgium with these tales of blood and cruelty clinging to them, if what you have been told is true?

I think that the most important thing to put before you is this: Mr. Morel has treated with splendid scorn the suggestion that there is any commercial motive behind the Congo Reform Association in England; he has suggested to you that because of the splendid names which we all honor in England, the owners of which are members of the Congo Reform Association, therefore it has nothing to do with commerce. May I point out to you that every pamphlet, every speech, every document which I have seen from the Congo Reform Association starts with the humanitarian aspect of the question and ends with the commercial side of it, or else it begins with the commercial side and ends with the humanitarian. Those two questions, in all their pamphlets, are indissolubly connected. I feel that it is necessary to lay before the American people, when this matter is presented to them, the fact that this agitation emanates from Liverpool, that the headquarters of the West African ———

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that, as our other speaker made no aspersions upon the character of the society which you represent, and as what we wish to know is just what you know to the credit of the management of the Congo Free State, it is due to us to use your time in that way instead of in the way you are using it.

MR. HEAD: I assure you I had no wish in any way to trespass upon the hospitality that has been offered me.

Let me put it then from the point of view of what is being done in the Congo. It is perfectly plain that in every colonial quest there are almost certain to be acts of cruelty which are regrettable. But the position that we take is this: That country was taken, over a million square miles, an enormous territory. In the early days of the enterprise there were difficulties because we did not get complete control. But the acts of cruelty which have occurred have occurred not at the hands of the government, but in spite of the government, and the government of the Congo Free State is doing to-day everything which it is able to do to prevent acts of cruelty to the natives.

The government has had to learn by experience as time went on. In the early days some of the agents, some of the government officials, were paid so much according to the amount of rubber which they collected. It was found that this system led to difficulties and cruelty, and that has been stopped. In a similar way in the earlier days they allowed what are known as "black posts," that is to say, black soldiers in certain villages. It was found that those men abused their opportunities, and the black posts have been prohibited.

At the present time a commission of three men, three men of undoubted probity, have been sent out to the Congo to carry on an investigation far and wide, free and untrammeled, to endeavor to find out whether there is anything further that can be done for the amelioration of the natives.

Furthermore, the difficulty with which the state is face to face because of the agitation which has been brought against it in England is this: The majority of the charges are vague, and it is impossible for that reason to answer them. Now, I will repeat to you a challenge which has been made in England: The Congo Free State government desires investigation, and is not afraid of it; and if these people who bring these charges against the administration will give us any facts, any names, anything specific which will enable the government to investigate the matter and to see whether or not there is truth in the particular allegation, the government undertakes to show that if those facts are already in its possession the men guilty of them have already been punished. If, on the other hand, the facts have not been known to them, then the government will make an investigation, and the guilty shall be punished; or, if the accused are innocent of the charges brought against them, they shall take such steps to clear their characters before the world as they shall deem fit.

Now there is one other point on which I wish to touch before my time is up. I understand that in America the idea is largely prevalent that King Leopold makes a large private fortune out of the Congo. It is perfectly true that in return for the millions which he has poured into the state there is a large portion of the land which is called "the crown domain," but the revenues of that domain are entirely administered by three men in Brussels, and not one farthing of that money ever comes to the king's own pocket. Every farthing of that money is administered by these three men and goes for the work in the Congo, or occasionally to public works in Belgium, but not one farthing of that money ever goes to the king himself.

I do trust that when you see these startling reports which from time to time reach the newspapers, you will remember that the Congo Free State government is doing everything in its power for the relief of the natives.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Head will say if there is any distinct relation between the Belgian government and the Congo Free State.

MR. HEAD: The relation is this: At the present moment King Leopold is king of the Belgians and he is sovereign of the Congo Free State. A great deal of the money which has been borrowed for the development of the Congo came from Belgium. King Leopold has made a will by which he leaves the Congo on his death to Belgium if it will take it. If it takes it, it takes it free of all the money which King Leopold has given it. If Belgium refuses, France has the chance of ownership, but France must then pay off the national debt, which has been given by King Leopold and the Belgian people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then we understand that at present the government of the Congo Free State under King Leopold is what we call "personal government," autocratic government.

We have, rather curiously, been listening on this subject to two Englishmen neither of whom, I understand, has ever been in the Congo Free State. [Laughter.] We shall now have the pleasure of listening to an American who has been for seven years in the Congo Free State, who possibly can tell us something about how things are down there, Rev. W. H. Morrison.

ADDRESS OF REV. W. H. MORRISON.

As the Chairman has said, my reason for appearing before you this afternoon, to address you upon this very important subject, which is now becoming international in its significance, is the fact that for the past seven years I have been a missionary in the Congo Independent State, in the interior twelve hundred miles from the West coast and six degrees south of the equator, at the head of navigation on a great river. You can thus see that I have had abundant opportunity to observe the working of the government of the Congo Free State.

As my friend Mr. Morel has told you a little something regarding the founding of this so-called Congo Free State, it will not be necessary for me to go into that matter, or to describe to you the devious ways by which King Leopold succeeded in securing first from the United States and then from the other powers of the world a certain ill-defined recognition of the government which he had established out there prior to 1884, called the International Association. This International Association, you know, as the result of the Conference of Berlin in 1884 became the Congo Free State.

It is with deep sadness that I, along with many others who have lived in the Congo State, and are acquainted with its workings and have the interests of natives and foreigners at heart, must now say that every important treaty stipulation is being openly and defiantly violated by King Leopold and his so-called "Congo Free State Government."

I am going to picture to you what I find in the Congo Free State, and I want to say that such a result must come, inevitably, from the system of placing one man (and such a man as he is) at the head of twenty-five millions of people, and giving him absolute power.

According to the General Act of Berlin, we find that freedom of trade was guaranteed. Not only were citizens of all nations granted the right to reside in the Congo State and carry on commerce with the native peoples, but it was stipulated that the native peoples should have the right to offer their wares, the products of their land, in the free markets of the world. It was specifically mentioned that there should never be any monopoly of the land or its products. The question now is, "Has the Congo State government, or rather King Leopold, — for he is the government, — fulfilled and carried into execution that stipulation of the treaty?" I answer most emphatically, "NO."

The gradual and often underground processes by which freedom of trade has been throttled constitute one of the darkest and most shameless pages in Congo State history. One of the first acts of King Leopold, after his sovereignty over the country had been secured by the Treaty of Berlin, was to issue a decree appropriating to the so-called State all the lands not actually occupied by the houses and fields of the natives. Even this latter reservation meant little of real value to the natives, for they were given no title to their fields and hence could be dispossessed at any time. Thus we see that at one stroke of the pen the people were deprived of their ancestral lands.

But that is not all. In the earlier years of the State, a goodly number of traders, representing different nationalities — English, French, Belgian, Dutch, Portuguese — went into the country and secured from the government small concessions, or land grants, on which to build their houses and shops in order to trade with the natives, exchanging manufactured goods for the raw ivory and India rubber. This meant that the natives received something like the true value of their products. But this freedom of trade, though import and export duties were charged and enormous sums had to be paid for trading licenses, etc., did not bring in sufficient revenue to satisfy King Leopold, whose original philanthropy now began to be metamorphosed into avaricious commercialism.

A new idea was now conceived. Large areas, sometimes embracing hundreds of square miles, were given over to large land companies for exclusive exploitation, the government to have half the proceeds of said companies. As a concrete illustration of what this means, I can cite the situation at my own place, Leubo, on the Kassai river. Up to three years ago there were five separate and independent trading companies at that point. Since that time the government has organized in this region one of its monopolistic concessions and all these old companies have been forced into the combination. The result is that at Leubo there is now only one trading house; the other four, being deserted, have gone to ruins. Before this monopolistic company was formed, the price paid to the natives for rubber was about three francs per kilogram. After the company was formed the price dropped to fifty centimes, — in other words, from about thirty cents to five cents per pound. To add insult to injury, the native is forbidden to go into the forest and make rubber and sell it to any one other than the monopolistic company. If he does so, he is considered a thief for stealing what belongs to the company. Not only are the natives now deprived of the privilege of selling their wares in an open market to the highest bidder, but by the government's refusing to outside traders the right to buy land and trade within the prescribed territory of the monopolistic companies, an outrage has been committed on the citizens of the very nations which brought the Congo State into existence. I know a man who came to Leubo hoping to buy a small piece of land from the government and engage in trade. This was absolutely refused, and he finally went away after great loss to himself and the company which he represented.

But this is not all. In some of the companies thus formed the natives were a little slow about bringing in the ivory and rubber at the prices fixed. Then another expedient had to be resorted to. And just here begins that long and bloody story of Congo cruelty and oppression of which I shall speak later.

I have thus shown that now there is no longer freedom of trade in the Congo State; that the country has been appropriated by the government; that, with the exception of a small district in the extreme West, the remainder of the great interior districts, with the natives and the products, has either been farmed out to monopolistic companies for exploitation or is retained by King Leopold as his private domain, and this private domain is being exploited more mercilessly, if possible, than the territories of the companies.

The government gives the companies the right to organize armies and compel the people to bring in tribute of ivory and rubber. I have seen the steamers of the government time after time passing my place on the Kassai river loaded down with rubber which had been wrung from those native people at the point of the bayonet. You can't expect anything else. Talk about atrocities and cruelties in the cutting off of hands and mutilations and all those things; they must come as an absolute necessity from the system which is in operation out there. When you ride down the streets of your beautiful cities on your bicycles, with the tires made of rubber, and in your automobiles, with the tires made of rubber, it is barely possible that the very rubber that you are riding upon has cost a human life.

But I leave that point. I come here to-day to say that there is not a single American citizen in this great audience, — although the United States was the first power in the world to recognize the Congo Free State as an independent power, — I say that there is not a single American citizen who can buy a single square inch of land in that territory. You go and try it? I have seen a man in my town of Leubo staying in vain eighteen months trying to buy a little plot of land to carry on trade with the people, according to the rights guaranteed by the treaty with this country and with the other powers of the world.

The Congo Independent government, when it was originally formed, made an important treaty stipulation with the great powers that all was to be done that could possibly be done for the amelioration of the condition of the native people, for the encouragement of missionary enterprise, and for the introduction of civilization into that country. The mission with which I have been for seven years has for the last five or six years asked for some four different places as a new mission station, in order to start a new centre of life in the darkness there, and we have been positively and absolutely refused by this so-called government of the Congo Independent State. Those are facts.

As I have just said, King Leopold agreed that everything possible should be done for the amelioration of the native people, in the way of putting down slavery and lifting up the people. I arraign the Congo Free State here to-day, and say that the condition of the people out there at the present time is far worse than it was before King Leopold and the people who went to regenerate Africa, as they say, arrived. They have thirty thousand soldiers captured from the cannibal tribes, armed with repeating rifles, under white Belgian officers. They are stationed here and there all over this great territory, and they compel the natives to bring in tribute of ivory and rubber. They say that this money does not go into the pockets of King Leopold. I do not know where it goes, and I do not care where it goes, but I do know that those poor people are oppressed and ground down to the ground, and I call upon you to take off from their neck the heel which has been placed upon them by the civilized nations of the world. [Applause.]

At my own village I have time and time again seen thousands upon thousands of the people fleeing into the forest from those cannibal soldiers. A squad of those soldiers came to the village and the people all fled to the forest, and then the soldiers scurried around through the forest and caught eighteen men, and I saw those men going away with ropes around their necks on the 25th of last March. I can give you names and dates and figures, all you want. What we want out there is an international, impartial investigation. That is what we demand. [Applause.]

I have seen something of these "investigations," as they are called, conducted by the Congo government itself. Twice in my life out there I have brought charges to the government of awful cruelties, and an officer has come along and made an investigation. And then the matter has never been heard of again. I defy any one to show that a single person who has been guilty of those outrages has been punished. I make that statement to you of this great Peace Congress. [Applause.] I point to the chains and the lash and the rifles of the thirty thousand cannibal soldiers in the employ of the government of the Congo Free State, — and I leave it with you. [Applause.]

The Chairman: Is n't it perfectly extraordinary that in this age of the world any one man should have power, as our friend here has said, by his single will to give a domain of a million square miles and millions (no one knows how many millions) of people either to Belgium or to France as he pleases? [Applause.] Is n't it extraordinary that any man or any group of men or any nation of men should have a right to give away the land, the soil, the freedom to manage their own government, of any other group or nation of men? [Applause.] That is what we still do in the twentieth century, in what is called Christendom, civilized Christendom! And we have called China a heathen country, — with a civilization a good deal older than ours, if you please.

Now I am going to ask a Chinese lady to speak to you. And after she has spoken I want you to consider whether there are not other kinds of civilization besides that of which we boast. I have pleasure in calling upon Dr. Yamei Kin.

ADDRESS OF DR. YAMEI KIN.

I come to you to-day as a representative of another great continent. We have heard wonderful words which bring to us, it may be, great truths, which we hope will go home to your hearts, of the continent of Africa, but now we go to the continent of Asia. And perhaps it is fitting that Asia should be represented to you to-day by a woman, for you come to us, to Asia, and I hope that you will see what it is that we have to give you, just as we realize that you have gifts to bring us.

We will not speak of the invasions of Asia in the earlier centuries of human history; of that of Alexander who strove to conquer the world and was defeated in Asia; of those of the Romans, who strove to conquer the world and were defeated in Asia; but of this great invasion of Asia now once more with the renewed power, with the vigor of the West, in the very height of its strength, with the inventions of science to back it. That is what now we of Asia are facing.

But you bring to us gifts, as I have said, and we do not forget those gifts. You have brought to us the knowledge that has come to you through your investigations of science, showing us the power of consolidation, the power of organization, so that you can use many units of men, and massing them together drive them as one great mass with a proportionately increased power. You have shown us that frank materialistic curiosity has a mission in this world, and that the frank investigation of all that lies about us, and all that there is for human beings in the whole universe, also has its uses. For you have unlocked many secrets; you have delved faithfully and patiently in the world that lies about you, because, as you say, you do not know but that it may be the only world that you shall ever know. You have brought us in this way great gifts, and we thank you for them.

But what else have you also brought to us, and why have you come to us in these latter days? To bring us these gifts? To bring us this knowledge? What were the reasons for the beginnings of this last invasion of Asia? If we go back to the history of the East India Company, what was the reason that carried Great Britain and her force to India, — what was that for? For the sake of money, for the sake of treasure, for the sake of things which excited the cupidity of the people who did not possess them. Not content with the process of trading, not content with honest exchange, they would wring from another people the possessions which they had. And in the face of your great commandment of the Decalogue, — which you received from Asia — " Thou shalt not covet," the West coveted the possessions of East India. [Applause.] She obtained what she wanted, and it is to the credit of the spiritual life which sustains Great Britain that there was an impeachment of Warren Hastings. But what has England done? She has brought, as I have said, gifts to India. She tells you of her wonderful penal codes; she tells you of her railway system, of the reduction of taxes, that she has spread abroad throughout the land knowledge which was not there before. But now, after a century of rule in India, the country is impoverished, and the most ardent advocates of English rule say that it is most wonderful that all that made India famous, her arts and her architecture, have disappeared. And why have they stopped? Because the English tradesman desired to sell his goods, and therefore the Indian craftsman was discouraged and all the native Indian manufactures died out. These native Indian arts were a great gift to this world, of knowledge and of beauty, a gift which we fear may not be replaced, but which we hope in the future will under different management be enabled to grow again. [Applause.]

With this blessing of peace, which is so vaunted in India, they have taken from the people their land, not exactly by a stroke of the pen, as it was taken from the people in Africa, but by a process which was legal according to the new laws which were made. This process is driving out the landed proprietors of India, until there are thousands of people homeless, thousands of people now who have no land. The land has passed into the hands of a rapacious set of money-lenders, that India never knew in the old days. Which rule is best for man? To be sure, they would not always do things in the good old British way, but they were happy, they were fed, they were making progress, they were going on developing themselves.

Now from India the great powers have gone on until they have come to China. And what do we see there? It was in order to gain the fifteen millions sterling a year profit upon opium that the war was waged upon China. The Chinese government said: "Do not legalize this traffic in opium, and we will trade with you in everything that you have to sell; we will sell you anything that we produce." [Applause.] The old emperor of China made a dying appeal to the government of England, to the queen of England as a woman, as a ruler, as a human being with the sense of right and of justice in her heart, which our philosophers have taught us dwells in every human breast, and the only answer to that appeal was that England cannot interfere with the trade of her subjects.

Then we see that, with this inauspicious beginning, misunderstandings have arisen, and I do not say but that we of China have been oftentimes arrogant. Yet if you will read the history I think you will see that we have borne it with the courtesy, with the kindliness, with the forbearance that has been instilled into us by our sages for many generations — as you would not have borne it had any other people come to you in the same way. [Applause.]

And now, in this last phase of it, we see the country that was last opened to civilization, Japan, by virtue of her mobility, through the fact that she had but recently acquired the one civilization from China and was ready to accept any new thoughts that came to her, quickly perceiving the danger that threatened Asia, has laid aside the traditions, the principles that inspire us in the East, which we have found to be the great principle of life, that of toleration to other people, that of trying to see the best and of living for more than the mere material interests of this world. Perceiving the danger that was about to overwhelm the Asiatic continent, she has taken the arms and the sciences of the West, assimilated them in a marvelous degree, and shown to the Western world that if need be the Asiatic continent is able to supply people who can use the most complicated contrivances and inventions of the Western brain as well, as effectively, and with the spirit of the East behind them. And now the cry is, "A Yellow Peril!" [Laughter.]

But, friends, the war that Japan is waging need not give you fear of the "Yellow Peril," for I want to tell you now what it is that animates us in the East. We have seen that you have come to us in Asia primarily for the sake of greed. Incidentally you have brought us gifts; we thank you for the gifts, but remember we recognize the greed. [Laughter.]

In the East we have learned the lesson of self-renunciation, that one must live in the spirit, that one must live for principles which demand self-sacrifice, and live not for the individual self only, but for the good of the whole. And having learned that in our social system, in our governmental system, sometimes we have been accused of being an absolute monarchy. But our king, our emperor is ruler, we say, by the will of heaven; that is, we recognize that it is right for a man to rule over the country, but we say he rules by the will of the people. We bring to you now that you have come to know us better the message of this renunciation, of this power of giving up our bodies, giving up ourselves, giving up our minds to what we hold to be a worthy object, and that object not material, not of this world.

There is another thing which the Western world has yet to recognize, and that is the æsthetical message of the Orient [applause]; for as we have laid aside the material things of this world, so we have learned to understand beauty in its true sense; and the message of the Orient is to turn from the material to the true things and to learn what beauty is, of form, of color, of manners and of organization, so that each shall be carrying out your own Christian principle which you understand but vaguely yet.

We accept your gift of the knowledge of science, which shall bring to us indeed a new life; of your principle of organization, which shall help us to stand against you. [Laughter.] And we have the greater gift to give you in showing you how much more courtesy, kindliness, gentleness, considerateness, the true Christian principle of love, can do towards easing the relations which each bears to the other, bringing us to the true conception of duty.

In spite of your emphasis upon individualism, your civilization tends to the machine, and you have yet to come back and learn that people can live the simple life, and yet, it may be, enjoy a great sense of beauty which shall bring joy, a great sense of the duty of people's relations to each other, which shall bring harmony and true peace to the world. [Great applause.]

The Chairman: I have now to ask your attention to the last speaker, who brings with him the traditions of the church of that great citizen of Boston, I should rather say, citizen of the world, that great lover of humanity, William Ellery Channing. The Rev. Paul Revere Frothingham, pastor of the Arlington Street Church, will now address us.

ADDRESS OF REV. PAUL REVERE FROTHINGHAM.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: First of all I want to say that, as the meetings of this Peace Congress are drawing to a close, we as a city, we as a state, we as a country shall profit infinitely by having had this Conference here within the bounds of America. [Applause.] For I am very conscious, and I think you must be too, of a certain strange, unaccountable tendency in America for our statesmen and our people to feel that there is some peculiar virtue in following Old World methods. We are, I regret to say, inclined to fall into line with this idea that we are speaking of this afternoon, for the strong to reach out and encroach upon the weak. It is a great thing, therefore, to have these foreign statesmen, these foreign reformers, come over here to America from the Old World and say to us, " Keep true to your New World ideals [applause], and don't be deluded into thinking that there is any virtue or any glory or any power in following our evil example." [Applause.]

I want to refer to some words that were spoken the other night by that great and independent Bishop from England, the Bishop of Hereford. [Applause.] I want to refer to them because I believe they have peculiar significance in regard to the subject that we are discussing this afternoon. He said, as well as I can remember, that in the religious world we have got away from the idea that there is one dominant faith which, because it is so true and so righteous, has a right to impose itself upon other faiths. We have got away, he said, from the idea of a dominant class in society, which, because of its power and its prestige, has a right to oppress and to rob other classes. And so, he said, we must eventually get rid of the dominant nations in the world, which, because they have power, because they have what they call civilization, think they have a right to impose their ideals and their principles upon nations and upon peoples who do not want them. [Applause.]

We have listened here this afternoon to that awful tale of the Congo, so awful that many of us, I fancy, would not have believed that such a state of things could exist at the beginning of this new century. We have listened to that tale of woe and misery. Now the thing that we are trying to do, that we have been trying to do for years and years, is to make it clear that what is right for an individual is right for a nation [applause], and what is wrong for an individual is equally wrong for any nation. [Applause.] Now, strangely enough, what do we find? We find in the ranks of our society of daily life that the mere fact that an individual is unprotected, is weaker than others, is unsuccessful, perhaps is small, calls out our chivalry and makes that individual just so much the more our brother. In the ranks of humanity the mere fact that an individual cannot protect himself, the mere fact that he is weak or suffering from one cause or another, makes us as individuals instantly go to his assistance. But what is the state of things in the great family of the nations of the world? Because one nation has not power, because it is weak, because it is isolated, because it is not as far advanced as some others, it is believed to be the legitimate prey of some greater and more powerful nation. [Applause.] Here is this terrible war going on in the distant East, going on just because of this process of aggression which we call "expansion." And while we are talking about the horrors of the war there between Japan and Russia, do you not believe that there are horrors equally great in that country of Tibet which is being encroached upon by the great English nation?

It was an old Hebrew Prophet, who is quoted often, who emphasized the need of calling things by their right names. We, in our individual lives, need something of that. We have grown into the habit, if a man steals enough money, not to call it theft, but to say that it was only "misappropriation of funds." And so in regard to this matter of expansion of civilization, as we call it, this "benevolent assimilation." People say it is civilizing processes going out from a great centre to bless the world; but when we get the courage to call it what it is, theft, to call it what it is, murder, to call it what it is, aggression, then we shall have done something to right a universal wrong. [Applause.]

So I hope that just because this Congress has met here in this historical city of ours, and in this great and strong and free country of ours, it will do something to hold us as Americans still fast to the great ideals and principles of the founders. [Applause.]

The meeting then adjourned.

Public Meeting in the Old South Church.

Friday Afternoon, October 7, 2 o'clock.

THE PROGRESS OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT IN EUROPE.*

A public meeting to hear of "The Progress of the Peace Movement in Europe" was held at 2 o'clock Friday afternoon in the Old South Church. Edwin D. Mead presided, and in opening the meeting spoke briefly of the strong efforts and distinct advances in Europe in the last five years, which have been an incitement and encouragement to the workers in America.

REMARKS OF G. H. PERRIS.

G. H. PERRIS, editor of *Concord*, was introduced as the first speaker. Mr. Perris spoke briefly of a recent visit which he had made to Russia, and of the condition of things which he found there. Owing to the peculiar system of government, the people were in a state of oppression and practical slavery. They had no voice in the management of public affairs and were thwarted in every wish to improve their condition. He regretted that there was no delegate to the Peace Congress from that country. The Russian people were a good people at heart. The masses of them were thoroughly pacific in disposition, though he thought the government was far from being so.

Referring to his own country, he said that there had come to England a real awakening to the sin and folly of the South African war. They were reaping the bitter fruits of the war in the form of increased taxation and general business depression. They had come to realize how they had been duped into the war by the Rand speculators, who were now appearing in their true colors. He condemned Chamberlain, and said that his present campaign was an indictment of his own claims for imperialism. He believed that territorial expansion would prove as costly and futile to the United States as it had proved to Great Britain. He said that the peace sentiment had been rapidly growing in England since the close of the unfortunate Boer War. King Edward was showing himself a sincere and effective peacemaker. The British government had concluded with France the first of the series of treaties of obligatory arbitration recently signed, and had, as was well known, entered into an agreement with that of France for the adjustment of all the outstanding differences between the two countries.

---

*The editor of this Report regrets that he is unable to give a fuller account of this important meeting. But no complete stenographic notes of the addresses were taken, and he has had nothing to use but a few brief newspaper notices, except in the case of the address of Professor Wuarin, which was in manuscript.

REMARKS OF PROFESSOR QUIDDE.

Professor Quidde of Munich, who was the next speaker, spoke of the deep native idealism of the German people which makes always for peace and true progress, and in the long run will counteract all militarism. Of course, Germany was still dominated by militarism, with its universal conscription, and it was not an easy thing to make headway against it. It laid heavy burdens of taxation on the people. But peace sentiment was growing in an encouraging way. There were now about seventy peace societies, or sections of the general peace society, located in important parts of the empire and doing a great work. These societies had about twelve hundred active members, and there were many who sympathized strongly with their aims, who had not yet actively associated themselves with the movement. He believed that the hostile feeling in Germany toward France was fast dying out. The German government had now also entered actively into the arbitration movement. The submission of the Venezuela difficulty to the Hague Tribunal was first proposed by Germany. The German government had entered into a treaty of obligatory arbitration with Great Britain to run for five years, and would doubtless soon conclude similar treaties with the United States and other countries.

REMARKS OF WILLIAM RANDAL CREMER, M. P.

The next speaker was Hon. William Randal Cremer, M. P., the founder of the Interparliamentary Union. He said that the Union had grown out of a meeting of members of the British and French parliaments in 1888, to discuss the subject of an Anglo-French arbitration treaty. It was decided to hold a similar meeting the next year in Paris at the time of the Exposition and to invite members of the other national parliaments to attend. The result was the definite organization of the Interparliamentary Union in 1889. The Union had grown until it now had more than two thousand members. Fifteen parliaments now had arbitration groups connected with the Union, the last to be created being that of the United States Congress, which was organized in January last. The Union had given its attention chiefly to the promotion of the principle of arbitration, of arbitration treaties and a permanent international tribunal of arbitration. The scheme for an international tribunal adopted by the Conference of the Union at Brussels in 1895 had been most useful in preparing the way for the International Court of Arbitration at The

Hague. An official representative of the Czar of Russia had attended the Conference of the Union at Budapest in 1896, and his report to the Emperor had much to do with inducing him to call the Hague Conference.

Since the establishment of the Hague Court, the Union had devoted itself to the extension of the scope of the work and influence of the Court, and to efforts to induce the governments to enter into specific treaties stipulating reference of disputes to the Court. In this direction he thought it had done most useful work.

Mr. Cremer then gave a brief account of the meeting of the twelfth conference of the Union at St. Louis the second week in September, of the resolutions adopted there, especially of the one urging the calling of a new International Conference to deal with the questions left unfinished by the Hague Conference of 1899. He spoke of the visit of the delegates to Washington, and of their interview with President Roosevelt. He eulogized in emphatic terms the attitude of the President toward the proposal of the Union that a new international Peace Conference should be called to continue the work inaugurated in 1899.

In concluding, Mr. Cremer referred to the great encouragement which had come to the friends of peace in Western Europe because of the new relations between France and Great Britain.

REMARKS OF MR. ALPHONSE JOUET.

Mr. Alphonse Jouet of Paris, who was next called upon, said that peace sentiment had made substantial progress in France through the influence of Victor Hugo and others, especially since the days of the Franco-German war. That war, which had taken away from France two provinces, had left a deep feeling of revenge among the French people. That war and the feelings of revenge and hostility left by it had cost both France and Germany dearly in the maintenance of their great armaments since that time. This feeling of revenge was, however, dying out in France, and a better and more rational state of mind and heart was taking its place. The peace societies in France were growing and widening their influence. The recent National Congress of Peace held at Nîmes, at which six hundred delegates and adherents were present, showed clearly how deeply the movement was taking hold of the people of France. In the Chamber of Deputies was a strong organization which was doing most remarkable service in the cause of arbitration. The French government also was most warmly interested in the cause, as was seen by the fact that a number of treaties of obligatory arbitration had already been signed between France and other countries, and still others were under consideration.

REMARKS OF J. G. ALEXANDER.

J. G. Alexander, Secretary of the International Law Association, gave a brief account of the negotiation and signing of the recent treaties of obligatory arbitration. The first of these treaties had been concluded between France and Great Britain in October, 1903, after an earnest campaign of education in which the commercial interests of both countries had been most active and influential. Nine other similar treaties had since been signed, namely, between France and Italy, Great Britain and Italy, Denmark and the Netherlands, France and Spain, Great Britain and Spain, Spain and Portugal, France and Norway and Sweden, Great Britain and Norway and Sweden, and Great Britain and Germany. The mere signing of these treaties was something to be most grateful for. They were, most of them, limited both as to time and scope, but they manifested in international relations a new and growing spirit which would in time accomplish much more. The treaty between Denmark and the Netherlands, being without limitations, was an admirable convention, and would certainly in time lead to the conclusion of like treaties between other countries. A number of other treaties modeled after the one between France and Great Britain were already under discussion and would doubtless soon be signed. All this was most encouraging to those who had so long labored for the establishment of arbitration as a permanent method of dealing with controversies among nations.

The last speaker was Professor Louis Wuarin of the University of Geneva. His address, which was in manuscript, was as follows:

ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR LOUIS WUARIN.

Ladies and Gentlemen: My single object when I landed in this country, a few weeks ago, was to attend the Congress of Arts and Sciences at St. Louis. Of the Peace Congress at Boston I was entirely ignorant. On receiving the flattering invitation of the president of the Committee on Organization to take part in its proceedings, I felt somewhat embarrassed. What could I say which had not already been expressed or which could not be presented to this audience with an authority to which I cannot pretend?

Of course, I am a friend of peace. I come from Geneva, Switzerland, where the Red Cross Society originated, which prepared the way for new efforts in the line of international understandings. I am in my country a member of the Peace League, and even belong to its committee. I have been associated in some measure with the work of propaganda which we carry on, but, I must confess, in rather a slack way. On theoretical grounds, as a philosophical thesis, the excellence of peace between societies of men as well as between individuals has nowadays become a sort of truism in civilized countries.

But all this would not confer upon me the right to speak in such an imposing gathering as is meeting in this hall, were it not that in standing here on this platform I bear witness to a great fact. By so doing I help to manifest the ardent sympathy which the peoples of the world should show toward every attempt that may be made to render peace as sure as it can be in the intercourse of nations. This is of paramount importance; public opinion becoming more and more the law of the world, we all perceive that nothing must be neglected to keep it alive and conscious of its new position and power.

I may also add that when I received the invitation to speak upon any aspect of the peace and arbitration cause that lay nearest my heart, it took me but a very little time to discover two main preoccupations that were brooding in my mind, waiting precisely for some opportunity to express them.

We all agree that war must be replaced by arbitration. But this attainment, which we greet at a distance as the advent of a new era, belongs to a state of things which has not come yet and is part of the future. We must therefore, while recommending international arbitration, look also to every measure which may, for the present, prove useful in the way of the preservation of goodwill between nations. And here I would like to point out to you a vice in our present international conditions which must be remedied by proper measures, as experience and reflection may commend.

When hostilities break out between two governments, the fight does not begin at the moment a declaration of war has been made. Such a declaration does not always occur before the sword has been drawn, and at any rate it is only an announcement of what took place in the secret councils of the two belligerents. War begins in fact at the moment when some men, sometimes very few, sometimes a single statesman, throw a country into some kind of a collision with another country. This is an old story, and it would be tiresome to repeat it except in its great outlines.

Some friction has developed between two nations. The incident could generally be compromised, and party newspapers assert it will be. But it soon appears that one of the governments, sometimes both, are playing a shrewd game, trying, for instance, to gain time in order to better their armaments and then be able to impose their will by the menace of their military force. This, however, cannot last, and the little comedy is apt to turn before long into the darkest of tragedies. One of the two contestants soon discovers that he is being deceived and misled by the tricks of diplomacy; he then sends an ultimatum, and the other one, feigning to take such a step as an attack unforeseen and violent, tries to present himself before the world as being in the sad necessity of resorting to arms in legitimate defense. Then the war begins to rage with all that horror which makes one pale and sick with disgust.

In presence of such facts, the question arises: How can irritating discussions be prevented from degenerating into a state of warfare? The answer is, In just the manner in which we deal with children who seem ready to come to blows; we ask them to keep their temper, to abstain from abuses and violence, and to go before a common friend or some good adviser to explain the causes of their dispute. What we lack here and what we need is what I would call a *Chamber of Fair Discussion*, where the arguments presented on both sides could be officially registered, so to speak, and could receive the light of publicity.

We have now a tribunal at The Hague due to the bold and noble inspiration of the Czar of Russia. Do you not think, ladies and gentlemen, that the Court of Arbitration could perhaps, to great advantage, be enlarged by the Chamber I am speaking of, where nations having difficulties should come, not for the sake of arbitration, but for a hearing which would ascertain the simple truth in the matter, uninfluenced by prejudice, machinations and false reports of any kind?

But here we meet another difficulty. At what precise moment does an international controversy cease to be of a friendly character and begin to assume a threatening aspect? Or, to put it in another form, when must ordinary diplomacy withdraw in order to permit a public and fair discussion of the nature of the case at the hands of the new Chamber I am advocating? It seems to me that the time for the Hague Court to take the place of diplomatic agency is when the friction between governments begins to be accompanied with the sending of troops to the frontier, or exceptional military measures to be explained only as the expression of designs of a menacing character.

In concluding upon this point, I repeat that it would be most expedient that the great Tribunal of The Hague should be charged with the task of placing under tutelary supervision the conduct of negotiation between two governments having subjects of complaint. Such a course would become compulsory at least in this case, that if some one should refuse to accept a discussion with an adversary according to the rules laid down for a correct exchange of views, he would, by so doing, admit that he had war on his program and thus injure his position. If my information is correct, something like the Chamber of Fair Discussion exists in germ in the Commissions of Inquiry provided for in the Hague Convention. But let the germ develop.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I come to my second point.

We are working here against war and for peace. Suppose we should succeed in the realization of our noble dream, something still would remain to be done in order to protect all the victims of brutal violence.

I am thinking of the unfortunate races which, even in time of peace, when no war is being waged, are exposed to all the evils of war and sometimes to more than that. In regular wars there are at least some laws which can be relied upon. The two belligerents wear arms and no one of them receives a blow which he does not hope to return. This, I admit, is awful enough, but there are things still more worthy to elicit our consideration. There are men, tribes of men, remaining such in spite of their small numbers, whose destiny it is to be subject to all the atrocities of war without being authorized to make the stand they could against their organized murderers. Arms are considered a proper thing for their enemies, but not for them, and if they should use only a rifle or a pistol, they would be accused of violating the statute by which their legal situation is defined, and exposed to the severest punishments.

I regard myself as bound to speak here for one of these forsaken populations. My position as professor at the University of Geneva has made me acquainted with some of the finest specimens it would be possible to find of the Armenians. We teach them, and the last pupil of the faculty to which I belong who graduated last summer was an Armenian lady. The orphans of poor Armenia are an object of great solicitude among us. A committee has been formed to collect money which, in general, is being sent to the admirable American missionaries living in Armenia, to help them in the support of their schools and asylums. Some of these children have also been taken into Geneva families. Moreover, we are greatly honored by having in our city the editors of *Droschak* (which means "The Flag"), the organ of the Armenian Federation. You might see among them young men who went through the Turkish prisons and retained after their heroic ordeal shattered health, but an undaunted faith in better times.

When I was preparing to come to this country, the editors of the *Droschak* asked me to transmit to the Congress of Arts and Science at St. Louis a plea in favor of their nation. After the invitation to attend this Congress had reached me, I said, "Boston is the place to fulfill my commission."

Permit me to quote some lines of the pathetic appeal to the American nation which I have here with me written in French:

> "Europe remains silent; the same Europe which twenty-six years ago, in the Berlin Congress, took the Armenians of Turkey under its august protection, seems to-day to be unable to assure that people of its right to existence.
>
> "The American nation has of late given proofs of its powerful influence in the international Areopagus, even on the shores of the Bosphorus. She has departed from her strict neutrality of former times and interested herself in the destiny of oppressed populations of the ancient continent. You have certainly not forgotten the case of the Jews in Roumania and the intervention of the United States in their behalf."

Here is the cry of a half exterminated nation that comes to you across the land and the sea. And striking enough is the circumstance that at this very Congress of Boston I have met two ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Armenian people who have come to Washington and are going everywhere repeating: "Can we not expect from America what the signers of the Berlin treaty, divided and weakened by their conflicting interests, have been powerless to execute? They gave us the most encouraging official assurances, but these promises were not kept, and we continue to be visited by the hords of Kurds who kill our men, our women and our children and set fire to our homes, which in civilized countries would remain sacred fortresses in the midst of the tempest raging outside."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, you are judges of the situation. What can this Congress do to answer the prayers of the unfortunate who are now coming to your country (where I am told they already number about twenty-five thousand souls), to save some wrecks of the valiant little people whose only crimes have been to remain Christians among Mohammedans and to be the only industrial, mechanical and inventive race in Asiatic Turkey?

Let me add only two more considerations.

I would remind you, first, that the Armenians are worthy of our respect and of our admiration, for the manner in which they have retained the cardinal features that characterize higher civilization. If woman may be considered as expressing, in the situation she occupies, the degree of culture and morality of any country, I take pleasure in recalling to your minds the fact that for six hundred years, in the midst of their trials, the Armenians have succeeded in keeping their wives and daughters singularly pure and filled with simple and noble ideals.

In the second place, I desire to confide to you the fact that not only the Armenians but the men of the Old World in general place their hope in the intervention of America, instead of in what has been called very improperly indeed the concert of nations. Your international influence begins to tell on the solution of great questions of humanity, and I take it for granted that to put an end to the precarious situation of the poor Armenians, it would be enough to have a word coming from Washington to this effect: "America does not permit an innocent people to be any more slaughtered in the plains of Asia Minor. She has no other interest here than the sacred right of mankind."

Peace Congress Banquet at Horticultural Hall.

Friday Evening, October 7, 1904.

The Peace Congress banquet given on Friday evening, October 7, in Horticultural Hall, was an occasion of extraordinary interest. Five hundred guests sat down to the tables, and many more tickets could have been disposed of if the capacity of the hall had been greater.

At the conclusion of the dinner, HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE, President of the Congress, called the gathering to order, and said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: It is my splendid privilege to bid you welcome, those who are from distant lands and our friends at home. We gather here in great numbers in a great cause, which is moving on towards victory. Never have we felt so confident as at this moment. No one can look into your faces and not feel that the cause of peace is moving on to triumph. I congratulate you. You that have come from abroad I thank in the name of us Americans. We are delighted to welcome you. We shall hope to see you here again when the cause has made still greater progress. I do not know how to interpret the feelings of heart with which we may rejoice in the rapid advance of this cause, the most important before the world.

You who went out to the Interparliamentary Conference at St. Louis and came back through Washington saw the President of the United States. You communicated to him your views, and received back from him an expression of his confidence in this cause, and his pledge to use his great influence in promoting it. You have come on to Boston, and we have had the splendid privilege of having the Secretary of State, a man known and honored throughout the world [applause], John Hay, come and give to us his pledge and promise, in which we rejoice, and which will be heard around the world.

These words I did not mean to speak, but they came to my lips when I stood up and looked into your faces. [Applause.] It is not for me to take your time, you have come here to listen to other speakers.

Let me only attempt to emphasize one thing; I said it the other day, let me say it again. We do not realize what progress our cause has made. Mr. Cremer is here; we are delighted to see him. [Applause.] He came over seventeen years ago with a petition from a goodly number of eminent Englishmen, addressed to our government, asking them to move in the cause of arbitration. Well, that attempt was, seemingly, like a bubble in the air. But it started the thing; it was the acorn which has grown into the oak. But it was only the beginning. Think what progress has been made since then! Is there any one in this hall who can state how many nations in the past year have acted in the cause of obligatory arbitration? Nine,— and among these nine nations ten treaties have been signed within twelve months. The cause is making such progress that it is difficult for us to appreciate ourselves, or to let the world know, with what rapidity it is moving. Our country has not acted as yet, but presently we shall swing into the line, and we shall be making treaties.

Excuse these words of mine; it is not for me to speak to you, but only to attempt to interpret in a single word the growing triumph of the cause. [Applause.]

We shall now listen to the speakers you have come to hear. We regret that our English friend, Dr. Percival, the Bishop of Hereford, who was expected, is not here with us. Owing to fatigue, our Chinese friend, Dr. Kin, is likewise not able to be with us. But I believe the rest of our speakers are all here, and we shall be delighted to hear them.

It is a great privilege to begin with the distinguished lady who has come all the way from Vienna, the Baroness von Suttner, whom I have the honor now to present. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE BARONESS VON SUTTNER.

Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen: May I ask your permission to say "friends?" And while I am asking your permission, I might ask a little more; may I call you dear American brothers and sisters?

You know that we are assembled here from the four corners of the world,— from India, from China, and, as the President said, from Vienna, to fight against violence. And yet you see before you a victim of violence in me, in that the committee has put my name on the list of speakers without even asking me if I felt competent for such an honor, which I would hardly have had the blindness to solicit. Is that not violence? [Applause.] But I must add that it is sweet violence to me, for it gives me an occasion to speak to you, and to express some of the feelings and the thoughts with which I have been overwhelmed by the reception that I have received, and by the proceedings of this Congress.

I have assisted at about ten Congresses, and I freely confess, and many of my friends confess the same, that the most important, the most wonderful of all the Congresses, the greatest of them all, is the one that is closing here. [Applause.] I do not know whether this is owing to the growth of the cause,— I suppose there is much in that,— but certainly it is owing to the soil on which we stand, the soil of liberty, where all the new and great ideas are at liberty to expand, a soil which is free from old superstitions and old prejudices.

And speaking of prejudices, you see this is the thirteenth Congress of Peace, and they say that thirteen is an unlucky number. Well, Boston will do away with that prejudice, certainly, for the thirteenth Congress has been a lucky one, a most happy one.

I think that I have been overrating my ability and your patience in stating that I will give you the impressions that I have had here. They have been too many and too overwhelming to be squeezed into an after-banquet speech. I will make them the subject of a pamphlet or a book. You can never be sure what an author is going to do with such a matter as this. I wrote a book about the Hague Conference, and I think there will be enough matter to write a book about the Congress at Boston. I hope, if I write it, that my publisher will be Mr. Ginn, who is with us.

Not wishing to speak of all my impressions, I will only speak of one little episode on the sea in coming to America. It was the third day of our sailing. The weather was not good, it was quite stormy. Suddenly we noticed a great agitation, people running up and down. What is the matter on the horizon? We saw a ship coming nearer, and heard the cry, "A ship in distress!" Everybody rushed to see what was going to be done. The captain gave orders to change the course and to come nearer to that ship, for somebody had cried, "She is on fire!" We came near to her in great haste, and saw a three-master, the top of which was burning. Every one in the ship had a pitying heart. The officers and the crew ran to the boats to save the crew of the unhappy ship which was burning on the waves. But as we came nearer we saw that the vessel had already been deserted. Perhaps the crew had been saved. Well, every one was happy to see that no one was in danger. But it was a beautiful moment for all of us to see with what zeal everybody wanted to rescue the life of a fellow-creature. And we say that man, whatever any one may say, is a good creature. [Applause.]

A few hours later Marconi brought to us a telegram from Japan and Russia, with the news that about twenty thousand slain were covering the ground, and the news was received with very great interest. A few hours before all of us trembled for one single life, perhaps, that had lingered on that unhappy ship; and now everybody hears with the greatest unconcern that twenty thousand are lying slain. Each took the part of one of the belligerents,— one was rejoiced to hear of the victory of that party, and the other was glad to hear of the defeat.

Well, I was perhaps the only one on board who saw the contradiction, because I was going to a Peace Congress, and I had the feeling that every life that can be saved ought to be saved, whether it is in the midst of twenty thousand or by itself, when it is on a burning continent, and not only on a burning ship. I thought, also, that this great contradiction in human society must cease, because every contradiction finally ceases. That is the sense of science, and it is the sense of civilization that the contradictions that are in our minds must fall, and that we must be in harmony with what we know and what we feel. When this harmony is established, I am sure that we will also go and hurry to the rescue of a poor, burning continent, and that we will not suffer that the lives of our fellow-creatures be destroyed.

I know there are other speakers that you are impatient to hear, so I won't add any other impression that I have had, leaving it for the book to be published by Mr. Ginn. [Laughter.] Then I only express the wish that when we meet the next time the progress of the cause will have been great, and that the whole world will recognize it. We are, as it were, in the Gulf Stream of peace here in this city, and we have, perhaps, the illusion that it is very warm; but still, outside of the Gulf Stream there is an enormous space of cold water in which the icebergs are swimming. Let us hope that all those icebergs will come into the Gulf Stream and melt.

I hope that we may soon again come together. And this word "together" I make my concluding one, for it is the whole sense of our work against war that we should be working together. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I now have the pleasure of presenting to you Pastor Charles Wagner, from Paris.

ADDRESS OF PASTOR CHARLES WAGNER.

Ladies and Gentlemen: Although I have with me in French a whole orchestra, and in English only one little pipe, I will play before you this little pipe, because I wish to be understood by every one, and you have told me you understand the kind of English I speak [laughter]; and I am not sure that you would understand the kind of French I speak. [Laughter.]

We Frenchmen are in a state of great thankfulness, and our hearts are grateful in this great ancient and venerable city of Boston for the very lordly hospitality we have found here. It seems to us that we have come, not to a foreign land, but among old beloved friends. We have found here surroundings and an atmosphere in which can be built a very grand and stately and luminous building of peace, of brotherly love. We remember that in this world there was a time, which is called the period of ice, in which there was on this continent and far towards the south only snow and ice. In the history of humanity there are also periods of ice,—chilly periods, in which people and nations catch colds. [Laughter.] And we hope that this period of ice, in which every nation from time to time catches one grand and awful cold, may vanish. We are gathering sunshine into our inward life that we may be able to make war against all the ice in the world, all the cold in the world between nations. We wish to have, not souls of darkness, but souls of light; not souls of snow and ice, but souls of light and souls of sunshine.

We will teach our children to be sunny to every one, to love everybody, to look toward other nations and other peoples, and to stretch out arms of help to every foreign brother.

I am one of those who would deliver us from many dead ideals, to which we sacrifice the best we have, and waste our breath, our money and our lives. I am an incurable friend of man, of every man and every nation. When I see a man coming from afar, I have emotion sometimes even to tears. When I heard that Lama from far India speak, when I listened to that Chinese woman, who has spoken to us and said to us that lovely word which in her language and in her country signifies peace, I was touched to the heart. Never has the most magnificent speech I have ever heard had such an influence on my heart as the English of this Indian Lama and of this Chinese woman.

The reason I speak in English is because every man should learn the language of his fellow men, every man should learn the languages of other nations. We need better to understand each other [applause]; we are ignorant of what is beyond the wall. I like a neighbor who from time to time comes to the wall of the garden and speaks to me and says, "Shake hands, neighbor: what are you doing in your garden?" so that we can have together talks about everything in the garden. We also should have talks across the wall, the thick wall of enmity which is between nations. [Applause.]

I am glad and happy to be among so many friends, and I would say to every one, as if we were only two or three, "May we light the fire, and may the fire increase and burn all over the world, the fire of peace and friendship."

And now my last word. Perhaps I shall never see you all again as now in this meeting. We feel that there is something unique in every moment. I feel in my heart what is unique in this moment, but I also know what is everlasting in this moment and will never go. And my wish is that our feelings of this moment may be everlasting, and become the true feeling of all mankind. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you will all allow me to say to Pastor Wagner that that is the sort of English we understand and like to hear. [Applause.]

I now have the pleasure of presenting to you Mrs. W. P. Byles of Manchester, England.

ADDRESS OF MRS. W. P. BYLES.

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen: Boston has been shouting peace all the week, and those shouts, like the shot of your embattled farmers, will ring around the world. At any rate, those shouts have awakened ringing echoes in the hearts of all your happy guests. I must confess, however, that I am a little frightened when I see that Boston has made peace fashionable. [Laughter.] I have been accustomed for so many years to find myself in a minority, that when I find myself at last in a majority I begin to ask myself, " Am I right, after all?" [Laughter.]

There has been a very Niagara of speech in all your halls and in all your homes, and I believe in all your churches, for once [laughter] this week, and I am not anxious to add to it on my own behalf. But I should like, and I value greatly the opportunity, to recall a few words which fell upon our own ears two years ago from one of your best and strongest voices, which has passed into the great silence. I refer to Mr. Holls, who played so prominent and valuable a part in the Hague Conference. [Applause.]

My husband and I had the great privilege of some hours' talk with him two years ago, and it was mainly about his work at The Hague and his hopes from that Conference. I think his hopes, as far as we could gather, were mainly from the atmosphere, the international atmosphere, which the holding of that Hague Conference and its practical fruit had created. He said that the very existence of the Court at The Hague would tend to the settlement of international difficulties outside of it. How true that forecast was has already been alluded to in most fitting terms by our Chairman's reminder of the recent arbitration treaties signed in Europe between several nations. If Mr. Holls had been with us here, — and I am sure he would have been in Boston had he been alive, — he would doubtless have told us what immense encouragement he had received privately and personally from the leading statesmen of Europe. One of those bits of encouragement has lingered ever since in my mind. Count Von Buelow had said to him at Berlin, " Never mind how much people may laugh at you and call you idealists, every Foreign Minister in Europe is your friend." [Applause.]

We have now found our most powerful promoter in this great nation of the United States. Your President the other day promised to summon a second conference at The Hague, and naturally and rightly he would be the first to say that his words would be of no effect unless he had at his back the whole public opinion of this great people. In our pilgrimage, the pilgrimage which your government so generously organized for the foreign delegates to the Interparliamentary Conference, through your states and among your industries, the thing that struck us most was the feeling of the people, the feeling of the man in the street, for this great cause to which Boston has set its seal. I have no doubt that many of the thousands of men and women who greeted these strange pilgrims had very little real concrete idea of what their message was, but they did understand its main burden to be peace, the abolition of war. In every city in which we found ourselves the response was eager, instant, generous. It was that response, and that response alone, which made your President's promise so full of meaning and so full of the hope with which we have regarded it.

We look to you Americans especially to help in this matter. The Bishop of Hereford said, in one of his early speeches to this Congress, that in America you were fortunate in being free from the vested interests which gather round the great systems of militarism in the Old World. Your vested interests are a mere nothing compared with those that are crushing the peoples of Europe. John Bright said, and said truly enough, that our military system in England was nothing more than a great system of outdoor relief for our aristocracy. [Applause.] Luckily for them, and luckily for us too, because of its indirect effect, our aristocracy has found on this side of the water a much healthier and happier and more friendly system of outdoor relief. [Laughter.] That will to some extent, I hope, help us in putting down the home system, at any rate of lessening the home system of outdoor relief. However that may be, you have freedom, you have power to decide from year to year what line of policy your government, your President, your state legislatures, will take on this question so entirely vital to the whole welfare, to the whole uplifting of your people.

My closing words shall be those of a man whom I know you honor and whom we love and honor from the depths of our hearts; I mean John Morley. He said, not long ago, "Let this be the vantage ground from which those threadbare sophisms of barbarous national pride, those dreadful fallacies of war and conquest which have undermined the greatest nations, shall be exposed." We look to you to expose and correct the deep-lying facts of heart and temper, as well as of understanding, which move nations to hostile and violent courses.

The Chairman: I shall now change the order of the printed program, and shall have the honor of introducing a gentleman who has done full service up and down our land, and is honored almost universally throughout our country, but especially in Boston, — Dr. Booker T. Washington. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF DR. BOOKER T. WASHINGTON.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: When I was a slave boy upon a plantation in the State of Virginia, I recall that once every week the black boys in our portion of the slave quarter were made to feel very happy, and that was on Sunday morning when every child was given two tablespoonfuls of molasses. [Laughter.] And I recall how, when it came my turn to receive my portion of molasses, I used to take my little tin plate and stand up in front of the individual whose duty it was to distribute the molasses, and after my portion had been poured upon my plate I would tip it to the right and then to the left, and then forward and then toward me, in order to make the molasses cover the entire surface of the plate, in a word, in that way to produce more molasses. [Laughter.] There is not an individual in this room to-night who could convince me that there was not more molasses when it covered the entire surface than when confined to one spot. Now during the few minutes allotted to me I am going to try to cover a large surface.

I wish to thank the members of this International Peace Conference for your interest in what is known as the darker or weaker races, and I wish to say a word concerning a portion of the world in which my race is especially interested, where at the present time there is a disgrace upon our modern civilization. I refer to the conditions that exist, and have existed for a number of years, in what is known as the Congo Free State in Africa. [Applause.] I have testimony direct from the lips of Dr. Shutworth, a former school-fellow of mine at the Hampton Institute, and from the lips of Dr. Morrison, a Southern man — and incidentally I wish to add that the going of these two men into the Congo Free State furnishes almost a dramatic side of history. One of them was the son of a master in the South, the other the son of a slave in the South. Hand in hand they have gone to the Congo Free State in order to help free those people from mental and moral slavery. [Applause.] And while they are attempting to do that, the influence of the civilized world should be felt in a direction that will free those people from the barbarities which they are now suffering. [Applause.]

Villages to-day are burned ; people are murdered or maimed. Dr. Shutworth tells me that with his own eyes in one village he saw eighty-one human hands which had been severed from the body and were hung up and dried, to be presented to the Belgian authorities as evidence that the soldiers had performed their duty. All of this is taking place—for what purpose ? In order that a few may be enriched at the expense of the many in that far-off country. Civilization should see to it that a change takes place. My friends, Europe should set a better example to my people in Africa. [Applause.]

You say I speak in behalf of the negro in Africa. Yes, that and more than that. I speak as much in behalf of the white man in Europe as I do of the black man in Africa. [Applause.] No man can oppress another individual without that man himself being degraded and dragged down. [Applause.]

> " The changeless laws of justice
> Bind up oppressor and oppressed ;
> And close as sin and suffering joined,
> We march to fate abreast."

Those beautiful lines of Whittier — I wish he were here to-night — will apply to conditions in Europe and in Africa and America. Though myself an ex-slave, I thank God that I have grown to the point where I have no prejudice against any human being on account of the color of his skin or the race to which he belongs. [Applause.]

There is another condition which concerns very largely my race, which should have the honest, the active sympathy and help of an organization such as is gathered here. For a number of years there has existed in our own country the practice of bands of men getting together in what are called mobs, to lynch and burn human beings who are guilty, or supposed to be guilty, of crime. I am glad to say — and, my friends, nothing within the last ten years has given me greater encouragement than what has taken place in this respect in the Southern part of the United States within the last few weeks — that from the pulpit, from the public press, from the lips of governors there has gone forth, and is daily going forth, a voice that is saying to the South and to all other portions of our country that we must get rid of that debasing and demoralizing habit of burning and torturing human beings without a trial before the law. [Applause.] I hope that this encouraging sentiment will have the hearty sympathy and the active support of every member of this organization.

My friends, let me add this: Race hatred, in my opinion, never settled any problem upon earth. The way for one race to show its superiority over another race is to exhibit a greater degree of mercy, of kindness, of forethought, of brotherly love. [Applause.] And no race, and no individual, in my opinion, is free, and no nation is free so long as it is ruled by passion and brute force. [Applause.] In proportion as it learns to exhibit the higher qualities, in that same proportion does the individual and does the nation become free indeed. No member of your race in Europe or in America can harm the meanest or the weakest member of my race without the purest and brightest and bluest blood in your own civilization being disgraced and degraded. [Applause.]

Let me add, in conclusion, that my race in one respect can teach the white races a lesson. We have been and are a peaceful race. We are not given to wars. To right his wrongs the Russian appeals to dynamite, the Cuban to revolution, the Indian to his tomahawk, the Japanese to his battleship; but the negro, the most patient, the most God-fearing, the most law-abiding of them all, has depended for the righting of his wrongs upon his midnight groans, his prayers, and upon an inherent faith in the justice of his cause. And, my friends, if we may dare judge the future by the past, who will venture to say that the negro's course has not been the correct one? And the policy which we have pursued in the past shall be our guide throughout the long and the distant future.

As a humble member of the black race, representing nearly ten millions of men and women with black skins in America, I want to pledge, through you, Mr. President, to this International Peace Congress, the sympathy, the coöperation, the prayers of my race in connection with every endeavor that you put forth towards spreading peace and charity and goodwill among all the races and the nations of the earth, to the end that wars and rumors of wars shall be no more. [Applause.]

The Chairman next presented Miss Jane Addams of the Hull House Settlement, Chicago.

ADDRESS OF MISS JANE ADDAMS.

There is an old story of a London showman who used to exhibit two skulls of Shakespeare — one skull of him when he was a boy and went poaching, and another when he was a man and wrote plays. It seemed more probable to that showman that two acts of creation should have taken place than that the roistering boy who went poaching should ever have peopled the London stage with all the world.

I should like to confide a secret to this audience; that is, that the human family, as old as it is in its national life, in its national relations, is still a very young roistering boy, that it is still using its poacher's head. No doubt when the young Shakespeare went out into the woods he was stirred by the spirit of youthful adventure, and he saw no other way of having a good time. There is no doubt that when he did these things he was reprimanded by the good people of Stratford; he was told that poaching was an evil; he was told to feel sorry for the deer; he might even have been told to organize a society to take care of the deer during its dying hours. He was not told, to be sure, to move into his grown-up head; as an alternative he had only his village public and the bad ale.

During this Conference many times I have wished that we might induce people to use not the poacher's skull, but that we might bid the international man to move into his grown-up skull; that we might tell him that adventure is not only to be found in going forth into new lands and shooting; that youth and spirit can find other outlets; that we might make clear to him the pleasures that lie in the human city. I do not imagine that when Shakespeare saw his Hamlet first walk upon the boards, he grew homesick for his deer stalking. I do not imagine that, if the race once discovered the excitement and the pleasure and the infinite moral stimulus and the gratification of the spirit of adventure to be found in the nourishing of human life, in the bringing of all the world into some sort of general order and decent relationship one with another, they would look back with very much regret, and wish that they might again go opening new lands because they found therein their only joy and their only pleasure.

If we could only stop thinking of mankind as a poacher, if we could believe that he is no longer quite so young as all that, if we could really make out that the gaiety of nations is not altogther horse-play, then I believe the peace movement would get a swing which would simply astonish us all.

I said the other night at the Labor meeting that the only place where we saw the rising feeling which was going to sweep war from the face of the earth was in the organizations of working men; but I have thought of a good many things since. For instance, I live in an Italian quarter: almost every Sunday our Italian friends come out and beat their drums and wave their flags and wear their uniforms to celebrate the fact that they have formed a little bit of a

Benefit Society and made a little wall between themselves and starvation and a pauper's grave. All over America we have these societies; they are taking to themselves uniforms and the fife and the drum and a good deal of the paraphernalia of war.

It is in this direction, I believe, that much of our hope lies. It is in persuading our fellow men that they are grown up; that if they once "catch on," if I may use that phrase, to the beauty of the human play, to the drama as it unfolds itself, these childish notions of power, these boyish ideas of adventure, these veritable rabble conceptions of what pleasure and manliness and courage consist in, will fall away from them as the garments of a child are dropped off from his growing form. [Applause.]

The next Peace Conference will perhaps add one more committee that shall gather together the beginnings, the dawnings of this larger life that we aim at, even if only to suggest it, if only to predict it; to tell us where we may turn to look for the coming release, for the coming of this newer and final activity. As I look through the audience I see Mr. Perris and other people who had much to do with bringing the Doukhobors into Canada. The Doukhobors, as you know, are a non-resisting sect. They were arrested in Russia for refusing to go into the army. One young man was brought before a Russian judge who reasoned with him and said, "Why do you not submit and join the army?" In return the young man gave him a long commentary upon the teachings of Jesus, and the Russian judge said, "That is very true; we all believe that; but the time has not yet come to put that into practice." The young man replied, "The time may not have come for you, your honor, but the time has come for us." [Applause.] Let us hope that in a few years we may all be able to stand up and say what Brother Washington was able to say for his race a few moments ago, that the time has come for us to accept at least passive resistance if we cannot accept dynamic and creative peace. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now have the pleasure of listening to a gentleman who has come from the beautiful land of Norway; who has been for many years a member of the Norwegian Chamber of Deputies, and for several years its president — the Hon. John Lund.

ADDRESS OF THE HON. JOHN LUND.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am sorry that I cannot express my feelings at this moment in my native tongue. It is of course a very difficult thing for a foreigner to address you in your own language, and you will forgive me for my bad English, and also forgive me for being bound to the manuscript under the circumstances, for I did not know that I was to speak to-night until I saw my name on the program.

A question often put to me during the weeks of my sojourn in the

United States, "How do you like America?" reminds one in its naïveté of a sweet child's wonted query, "Are you fond of me?" Well, I can truthfully answer that I am happy here, and if there are things which possibly a European would wish different, yet, on the whole, one can heartily say that America is to be admired. As we Europeans, representing the Old World, may, in a way, consider ourselves worthy grandfathers, so I am confident I speak for many when I assure you that we European fathers are proud of our American children.

To recount what one most admires is difficult. During the journey which as guests of your government we for a fortnight or more made through your States and cities, a whole series of fascinating pictures captured the imagination. We members of the Interparliamentary Union had only admiration for your systems of transportation, your industries, your beautiful rich country, your agriculture, your old and your new towns, which, like Chicago, Denver and others, seem in their half century's growth to be the outcome of magic, giving evidence, as they do, of a taste and beauty comparable to the capitals of the Old World.

It was a historical moment when in the White House your President assured our members that he would consider favorably our proposal that he call another Peace Conference of the governments of the world.

Of all the pictures which stay by me, two incidents are vividly outlined.

The very first days of my sojourn here gave me my first memorable American experience. It was a review. I have seen many reviews; I have witnessed the German Emperor's pride as he led his brave troops in person; I have seen many official and ecclesiastical processions, but never have I seen a more moving, beautiful or noble spectacle than that of the thirty thousand men in New York on Labor Day, as they were marshaled in review. Never have I in the Old World seen a workingman's procession in which so many self-respecting, manly men in holiday dress took part. One felt and knew as they marched past that they were free, independent, respected citizens, who themselves felt that they filled their places in life as well as any rich man, any aristocrat in the Old World. I stood with hat in hand, and as I looked I understood that the men representing the great business interests of the city and state showed their respect for the laboring man by observing Labor Day as a holiday. Let the workingman get knowledge, let him live under good conditions, and I am sure we shall there have the best guarantee for the world's peace.

The second occasion when I found myself deeply moved was in your own fine old city on that memorable evening when orchestra and chorus, half a thousand of them, and your leading men, more than two thousand of them, honored our workers with a sympathetic welcome in your beautiful Symphony Hall, when the audience of delegates and their hosts of friends filled that great auditorium, thus assuring us of your intelligent sympathy with our special work.

Both on that evening and on the occasion of our opening session, when your most distinguished statesman and other prominent speakers bade us welcome, I felt that in no other country was our mission in better hands than with the American division of our organization. In truth, it was a reception worthy of our great cause, worthy of your proud country, worthy of your historic city with its rich store of traditions.

I will conclude with a toast for America, and I invite my colleagues and every one here to join me in homage to your country in a nine-double Norse hurrah:

Long live the United States!
Long live free, independent America!

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to have the pleasure of hearing Mr. Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

ADDRESS OF MR. BLISS PERRY.

Mr. President and Friends of the Congress: You are anxious to hear Professor James, and so am I. I want to give one impression of the service rendered to the cause which we have at heart, through the publicity which has been given to the sessions of the Congress by the Boston newspapers. [Applause.] It is not necessary to speak of the service rendered to the cause of peace by literature; if logic and irony and wit and sweet reasonableness could have converted the world to peace, we should not be here to-night. Now a new machinery has been set in motion and a powerful impetus given to our cause through the publicity given to it by the daily press.

There are two misconceptions with regard to the work of this Congress which I believe the publicity given to the proceedings of the last week has forever set aside. The first of those misconceptions is that we who are interested in peace are somehow lacking in patriotism. You know the familiar argument that if a man is interested in international things he thereby loses his passionate faith in his own nationality. You have been told by Tolstoy and other great men that the patriotic note in literature and art is a vitiating note. Now I beg to say that the proceedings of the last week have proved the falseness of that theory. It is because we are good Americans and Norwegians and Frenchmen and Englishmen and Germans that we are here. Any international courtesies that we are showing or that we have been receiving are founded first of all upon national self-respect. [Applause.] You may as well say that the superb chorus of the Messiah to which we listened last Sunday evening suffered because the basses and the tenors and the altos and the sopranos each did their best with their characteristic voice, as to say that because a man is interested in a fraternity of civilized peoples he therefore loses in his patriotism toward the land of his birth. [Applause.]

I take Whittier as my example. There was an Essex County man and a Massachusetts man and a Northerner; yet he was an all-American, and by virtue of being a good Essex County man and a Massachusetts man and an American, he became a world's man.

Ladies and gentlemen, the unpatriotic man is not the internationalist: he is the citizen of any country who does not care what is going on beyond his own village so long as his own dinner pail is full. If he is an American, what makes him unpatriotic is not that he holds this or that view in regard to this or that policy: what makes him unpatriotic is the belief that the good Father at Washington will attend to all that and it is not any business of his.

The second misconception which the publicity given to the proceedings of this last week has, I hope, forever done away with, is the notion that the advocates of peace are impracticable dreamers, that they are visionaries and nothing more. We give the blue ribbons in this country to the men who do things, and have not Mr. Mead and Dr. Trueblood been doing things? [Applause.] Can you point to a single cause that has made more solid or trustworthy progress in the last ten years than this cause of international arbitration and peace?

Ladies and gentlemen, the visionaries are the men who can see nothing in the world but the chariots and the horses and the future campaigns. The visionaries are the men who have forgotten their multiplication tables, and forgotten history, and ignored human nature, and believe that it is safe to play with fire; who under the pretense of taking no chances are making chances; who are doing as they did in Melrose the other day — piling dynamite on a wagon, and then giving the wagon to a boy to drive. [Applause.] Those, I say, are the unpractical men. The advocates of peace have with a clear vision, with steady forethought and purpose, been building a straight road for the nations of the world to walk in, and that road can be seen of every man.

Let me illustrate that by one local type, and I am done. I hope our foreign friends in making the acquaintance of other Boston institutions this week have not failed to take note of the Boston policeman. He is one of the finest specimens of his profession; he speaks softly and he carries his "big stick" — in his pocket. He is patient, he is respectful, he is self-respecting. Now when the white-gloved hand of a policeman on one of our dangerous narrow crossings is raised, the whirling electric car and the murderous automobile and the laden dray stop, so that our women and children may go safely over. We respect the policeman, not because he is the embodiment of arbitrary, despotic force, but because he represents the peace sentiment of the citizens of Boston. Now we advocates of peace are not impractical enough to believe that the time has yet come when we need no police at the world's cross roads. We do need policemen in Armenia and in the Congo Free State; but we ask that they shall not be sent there by greedy powers or through the chivalry of a single nation. We ask that they shall stand there as the embodiment of international law, and backed by international public opinion.

I have used the Boston policeman as a type; I want to use our

Boston subway as an allegory. A few years ago Tremont Street was in a state of hopeless confusion — turmoil, blockade, warfare, nothing less. One day some one began a quarter of a mile away from Tremont Street to dig a hole in the ground. He had the subway in his mind, — and to-day men are carried from the suburbs of the city to the heart of the city by a swift and safe and pleasant course. Now when you return to your homes you will be able to tell your friends that you have been riding in the Boston subway, and you can also say that you have been helping yourself to dig a bigger and a better subway than that, namely, the road that leads straight from heart to heart of the great nations of the world, — the road of good-will. It is hard to do that kind of digging year in and year out. There is the solid rock of opposition still to be blasted. But we must remember that all the poetry does not belong to the men of war. We must praise this road that we are building against the shifting sands of popular sentiment, drifting, changing with the hour. But the road has already been marked, and the proceedings of the last five days have given another yard or another hundred yards to it; and those forward steps once taken can never be retraced. We have no right to say, in those solemn words that Tolstoy prints at the head of his pamphlet, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness." Perhaps we have not yet won the right to say, "This is our hour, and the power of right," but we can at least say with St. Paul, "Brethren, now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed." [Applause.]

The Chairman: I now have the pleasure of presenting to you the last speaker of the evening, Prof. William James of Harvard University.

ADDRESS OF PROF. WILLIAM JAMES.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am only a philosopher, and there is only one thing that a philosopher can be relied on to do, and that is, to contradict other philosophers. In ancient times philosophers defined man as the rational animal; and philosophers since then have always found much more to say about the rational than about the animal part of the definition. But looked at candidly, reason bears about the same proportion to the rest of human nature that we in this hall bear to the rest of America, Europe, Asia, Africa and Polynesia. Reason is one of the very feeblest of nature's forces, if you take it at only one spot and moment. It is only in the very long run that its effects become perceptible. Reason assumes to settle things by weighing them against each other without prejudice, partiality or excitement; but what affairs in the concrete are settled by is, and always will be, just prejudices, partialities, cupidities and excitements. Appealing to reason as we do, we are in a sort of a forlorn-hope situation, like a small sand-bank in the midst of a hungry sea ready to wash it out of existence. But sand-banks grow when the conditions favor; and weak as reason is, it has this unique advantage over its antagonists that its activity never lets up and that it presses always in one direction, while men's prejudices vary, their passions ebb and flow, and their excitements are intermittent. Our sand-bank, I absolutely believe, is bound to grow. Bit by bit it will get dyked and breakwatered. But sitting as we do in this warm room, with music and lights and smiling faces, it is easy to get too sanguine about our task; and since I am called to speak, I feel as if it might not be out of place to say a word about the strength of our enemy.

Our permanent enemy is the rooted bellicosity of human nature. Man, biologically considered, and whatever else he may be into the bargain, is the most formidable of all beasts of prey, and, indeed, the only one that preys systematically on his own species. We are once for all adapted to the military status. A millennium of peace would not breed the fighting disposition out of our bone and marrow, and a function so ingrained and vital will never consent to die without resistance, and will always find impassioned apologists and idealizers.

Not only men born to be soldiers, but non-combatants by trade and nature, historians in their studies, and clergymen in their pulpits, have been war's idealizers. They have talked of war as of God's court of justice. And, indeed, if we think how many things beside the frontiers of states the wars of history have decided, we must feel some respectful awe, in spite of all the horrors. Our actual civilization, good and bad alike, has had past wars for its determining condition. Great mindedness among the tribes of men has always meant the will to prevail, and all the more so if prevailing included slaughtering and being slaughtered. Rome, Paris, England, Brandeburg, Piedmont,— possibly soon Japan,— along with their arms have their traits of character and habits of thought prevail among their conquered neighbors. The blessings we actually enjoy, such as they are, have grown up in the shadow of the wars of antiquity. The various ideals were backed by fighting wills, and when neither would give way, the God of battles had to be the arbiter. A shallow view this, truly; for who can say what might have prevailed if man had ever been a reasoning and not a fighting animal? Like dead men, dead causes tell no tales, and the ideals that went under in the past, along with all the tribes that represented them, find to-day no recorder, no explainer, no defender.

But apart from theoretic defenders, and apart from every soldierly individual straining at the leash and clamoring for opportunity, war has an omnipotent support in the form of our imagination. Man lives *by* habits indeed, but what he lives *for* is thrills and excitements. The only relief from habit's tediousness is periodical excitement. From time immemorial wars have been, especially for non-combatants, the supremely thrilling excitement. Heavy and dragging at its end, at its outset every war means an explosion of imaginative energy. The dams of routine burst, and boundless prospects open. The remotest spectators share the fascination of that awful struggle now in process on the confines of the world. There is not a man in this room, I suppose, who does n't buy both an evening and a morning paper, and first of all pounce on the war column.

A deadly listlessness would come over most men's imagination of the future if they could seriously be brought to believe that never again *in sæcula sæculorum* would a war trouble human history. In such a stagnant summer afternoon of a world, where would be the zest or interest?

This is the constitution of human nature which we have to work against. The plain truth is that people *want* war. They want it anyhow; for itself, and apart from each and every possible consequence. It is the final bouquet of life's fireworks. The born soldiers want it hot and actual. The non-combatants want it in the background, and always as an open possibility, to feed imagination on and keep excitement going. Its clerical and historical defenders fool themselves when they talk as they do about it. What moves them is not the blessings it has won for us, but a vague religious exaltation. War is human nature at its uttermost. We are here to do our uttermost. It is a sacrament. Society would rot without the mystical blood-payment.

We do ill, I think, therefore, to talk much of universal peace or of a general disarmament. We must go in for preventive medicine, not for radical cure. We must cheat our foe, circumvent him in detail, not try to change his nature. In one respect war is like love, though in no other. Both leave us intervals of rest; and in the intervals life goes on perfectly well without them, though the imagination still dallies with their possibility. Equally insane when once aroused and under headway, whether they shall be aroused or not depends on accidental circumstances. How are old maids and old bachelors made? Not by deliberate vows of celibacy, but by sliding on from year to year with no sufficient matrimonial provocation. So of the nations with their wars. Let the general possibility of war be left open, in Heaven's name, for the imagination to dally with. Let the soldiers dream of killing, as the old maids dream of marrying.

But organize in every conceivable way the practical machinery for making each successive chance of war abortive. Put peace men in power; educate the editors and statesmen to responsibility. How beautifully did their trained responsibility in England make the Venezuela incident abortive! Seize every pretext, however small, for arbitration methods, and multiply the precedents; foster rival excitements, and invent new outlets for heroic energy; and from one generation to another the chances are that irritation will grow less acute and states of strain less dangerous among the nations. Armies and navies will continue, of course, and fire the minds of populations with their potentialities of greatness. But their officers will find that somehow or other, with no deliberate intention on any one's part, each successive "incident" has managed to evaporate and to lead nowhere, and that the thought of what might have been remains their only consolation.

The last weak runnings of the war spirit will be "punitive expeditions." A country that turns its arms only against uncivilized foes is, I think, wrongly taunted as degenerate. Of course it has ceased to be heroic in the old grand style. But I verily believe that this is because it now sees something better. It has a conscience. It will still perpetrate peccadillos. But it is afraid, afraid in the good sense, to engage in absolute crimes against civilization.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are others whom we should be delighted to hear from, but the hour is late and the program is completed. All that remains for me is to say to you good-bye, which being interpreted means, God be with you. Good-bye.

Fifth and Last Business Session.

Saturday Morning, October 8, 1904.

The President called the Congress to order in Park Street Church at 9.30 o'clock, and introduced a Japanese gentlemen, Mr. Jiro Abratani, editor of a daily newspaper in Tokio.

REMARKS OF MR. JIRO ABRATANI.

It is a great honor and pleasure to meet with the friends of peace, and stand here at this memorable meeting. I have not come to speak, but to hear; not to teach, but to learn. I could not, however, refrain from saying a word when invited to speak.

I have been preaching during fifteen years the gospel of war, not war in the ordinary sense, but spiritual war against ignorance, unkindness and unrighteousness.

Two voices now sound in my ears: one a terrible sound of cannon and horrible groaning of dying soldiers from the Far East; the other a sweet voice of angels of peace here. I inherited a very strong national spirit, but my humanitarian heart, with which our heavenly Father of love gifted me, earnestly desires that true peace may come soon and dominate eternally all the nations.

Fortunately, — I say fortunately, — it was unnecessary to have any peace society in Japan; not because she was a warlike people, but simply because she had not any conflict during two hundred and fifty years. After she shut her doors against the brutal power of Spain and Portugal, until Commodore Perry knocked at her door, she devoted her time and her energies to the cultivation of the arts, character and the pursuits of peace, enjoying the cherry flower in the spring and the chrysanthemum in the autumn, while European nations were busy fighting and expanding their territories by force of arms. Even swords and spears were used not in any practical military way, but only as decorations which you are familiar with as art, now in the Boston Art Museum. She was taught by Buddhist monks, "Do not kill any living creature, even a little sparrow," and by Confucian teachers, "Love others as thyself," and by Shintoist teachers, "Have a God-like heart full of purity, righteousness and compassion." About two hundred years ago, Banzan Kumazawa, a great scholar in Japan, taught us that "Heaven is father and Earth is mother; all nations are brethren; human nature is not diverse, and universal reason is one."

We Japanese as a nation have a great mission to preach benevolence and righteousness over the world as against the barbarism of East and West.

Japan was truly a peace-loving people, not a warlike people at all; but after she entered into international relations she was very unfortunately compelled to draw her sword against China and again against Russia, as you all know. It is not my intention, and you would not wish me to discuss here the present war between Japan and Russia. I truly humiliate myself now in behalf of the sacred principle of universal peace, which we earnestly desire to promote over the world, and I heartily shake hands with the Russian delegate.

I am afraid that militarism will grow year by year in Japan. I may safely say that the military spirit dominates now in Japan, and it will increase more and more after the war. Her industries are growing and her population is increasing very rapidly, so that it will be natural to see her infected by imperialism. My friends in Japan, who have insight and foresight, are already fighting against such tendencies.

You probably have read an interesting Japanese novel "Namiko," recently translated into English in this city, whose author Tokutomi is an admirer of Victor Hugo and Tolstoy, and dedicates his story on the altar of peace against militarism. My co-editor, Kinoshita, recently published a very powerful and inspiring story, entitled "Pillar of Fire," in our paper, in which he attacked very vigorously capitalism and militarism. His story was welcomed by many people.

Militarism is strong, and the power of the friends of peace is not yet so strong; and so we, I think, must fight in behalf of peace more bravely than Admiral Togo and General Kuroki are fighting. War is truly a disease of society. We doctors of society must not only negatively give the medicine to society, but positively must revitalize its energies; not only sentimentally attack the disease, but investigate, with cool and clear head, its causes, and use our power to prevent the disease's appearance. There are many causes, ethical and economical. We must wash out such superstitions, racial, religious and national, as bring on war; we must solve the modern question of industrialism.

In conclusion, I earnestly hope that not only Russia and Japan, but all the nations, may clearly understand, by the terrible example of the war in the Far East, how unethical and uneconomical war is, and may entirely abolish war from the earth. I hope the flags of all nations which were dyed by human vanity and have such awful symbols as lions and eagles, etc., may become a perfectly sacred white, colorless. I pray that all nations, forgetting their separate national war songs, may learn to sing in melodious harmony the most sacred song, "Glory be to God in the most high, peace on the earth and goodwill unto men."

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Chirurg has asked to be allowed to speak in regard to charges made against Russia yesterday, and he will now have the floor.

Dr. Chirurg: To exemplify the words that I said a few days ago, I will shake hands with the Japanese, Mr. Jiro Abratani, and I am glad to greet him as a fellow man. [Dr. Chirurg and Mr. Abratani here shook hands on the platform amid applause.]

All those who were present last night at the dinner heard Mr. Bliss Perry, the editor, talk, and among other things he said that a man loses his self-respect who is not a patriot, a lover of the land of his birth. I was amazed very much yesterday when my friends from England,— I would not say all the Englishmen, but a few, — under the resolution brought in regarding Armenia and the outrages perpetrated by Turkey, accused Russia of most terrible things. Although I am an American by adoption, I am a Russian by birth, and I cannot help attempting to tell you the true facts as I remember them when I was a boy, and as my father, who was a physician and a man of kindness and truthfulness, told me.

In 1876, when I was merely a child, the Concert of Europe, composed of Germany, Russia, Austria, France, England and Italy, had a meeting as to the outrages in Turkey, and they put pressure upon the Russian Czar, Alexander the Second, the liberator of the serfs, as you all know, as he was the only one who could liberate those oppressed ones in Turkey. Accordingly, Alexander the Second made a demand upon Turkey to stop the outrages, and when the Turk did not heed his demand he declared war, and the Russians had to fight against natural fortifications and barriers, and after losing hundreds of thousands of young men and hundreds of millions of money, when the Russian general was at the gates of Constantinople, a truce was asked; and which power of that Concert was it who stopped the Russians from preventing the oppression and outrages by the Turk? It was England! England made a demand on Russia not to go any further, and so the only people that were liberated from the oppression of the Turk were the Bulgarians. Had England stood by the Concert, I believe that in 1878 there would have been a cessation of all oppression in European Turkey, and all those who are crying for help now would have been liberated at that time.

I have here before me a paper which was handed to me to-day as I came into this room. The paper is called *Our Dumb Animals*, and on page sixty-seven I see a picture of a Mexican lynx, and under the picture this item: "The Mexican lynx is said to be the most ferocious and untamable of the feline family, but editor J. W. Hunter of the *Mason* (Texas) *Herald* sends us this picture of his young Mexican lynx, which by kindness he has transformed, he says, into a favored pet of all the children in town." I am here not to insult anybody; I am here to say that we are under one banner of peace, and that only by kindness can we tame the wild animal of war. I come here as a Russian to protest against those statements which were made against Russia, and which were not true.

I recall that when I was a mere boy, in 1877, we were told that a train-load of prisoners of war would pass through our town, and my father told a man to hitch up, and we went down to see them. There was a large train with first-class passenger cars for the officers, and second-class cars for the soldiers. Three hundred prisoners of war were there, under the escort of a few Russian soldiers, commanded by a captain who was afterwards a friend of my family. They were brought to my town and they were quartered in houses as good as the Russian soldiers occupied, and the Turkish officers were given quarters as good as the Russian officers occupied. They were clothed, they were fed, they were given the freedom of the country; they were not kept as prisoners, but as friends. This of itself shows that the people at large in Russia are not barbarous. It also reminds me of a day when I stood by the banks of the river in my town. A man,— I will not mention his nationality, but he was not a Russian,— attacked one of those prisoners of war without any cause. Immediately a mob gathered, and they were furious against him, and if he had not run for protection into a house he would probably have been dealt with very severely. I remember the address of the head of the town, the mayor, to the people, telling them that those prisoners were not there to fight, but that they were there as men and that we should use them as such.

MR. HERBERT BURROWS: *Mr. President:* As our friend and colleague from Russia has referred to what was said yesterday, I should like to make one word of explanation, as I made the strongest attack not on the Russian nation but on the Russian government. I am glad to say that amongst my dearest friends are Russian men and women. I did not make an attack on the Russian nation as a nation. I am perfectly friendly with them, and they are not responsible for the acts of their government.

I repeat in the strongest and most deliberate terms that I can use everything that I said yesterday about the barbarities of the Russian government. I repeat again that the barbarities that were practised on the Jews at Kishineff were practically inflicted under the orders of the government; they were backed up by the government officials. We have documentary evidence confirming every word I say. I repeat that those atrocities were equally as bad as, if not worse than, those which were perpetrated in Armenia by the Turks, and that if we want to be fair all around we must not condemn one nation and at the same time whitewash another. [Applause.]

Mr. Paine had to leave the meeting at this point, and Dr. Trueblood was called to the chair.

The Chairman read a letter of greeting and sympathy from the labor meeting at Faneuil Hall, and then called upon Dr. Darby, who presented the balance of the report of Committee A.

DR. DARBY: Our Committee has prepared the following resolution with regard to the Congo question. It consists of two parts, and one is a mere statement of facts:

Whereas, The International Association of the Congo in 1884 secured from the American government that its flag should be recognized as that of a friendly state (which recognition was subsequently endorsed by the powers of Europe at Berlin), on the ground that it was an organization formed to protect the interests and welfare of the natives, to promote legitimate commerce, and to preserve the neutrality of the Congo Valley over which it sought to exercise authority; and

Whereas, It is alleged that the government of the Congo Free State has appropriated the land of the natives and the products of commercial value yielded by the land, thus leading to the committal of grave wrongs upon the native races, and to the infringement of the rights secured for international commerce by the Act of the Conference of Berlin; and

Whereas, This is a question which may lead to grave international complications;

This Congress, in the interests of peace, recommends that the following questions should be referred either to a renewed conference of the powers concerned in the formation of the Congo Free State, or to a Commission of Inquiry as provided in the Hague Convention:

1. Is the government of the Congo Free State still to be regarded as the trustee of the powers which recognized the flag of the International Association?
2. Is the Belgian government to be regarded as responsible for the actions of the government of the Congo Free State?
3. If neither of these events, what is the position of the Congo Free State in international law, and in what manner may the grave questions concerning its alleged actions be satisfactorily and competently determined?

I think the last question proposed expresses the point of the whole. You see the report is twofold: first, the statement of facts, and then the recommendation that the questions involved shall be referred to a Commission of Inquiry as provided by the Hague Treaty, or, as is usual between the powers, to a conference among themselves. [Applause.]

DR. G. B. CLARK: *Mr. Chairman:* I think the second question ought not to appear in the resolution just read. The Belgian government is no more responsible for the condition of things in the Congo than we are. If the Belgian government had been responsible for it, then my friend La Fontaine on the platform and others would have taken care that it should not have occurred again.

I think the report is very wise, and the first and third questions recommended are the best that we can suggest; but the second one seems to me to imply a kind of slur upon the Belgian people and the Belgian government, as if they were responsible, when all the facts before the world show, and every one knows, that the king of the Belgians in acting in this capacity is utterly uncontrolled by his Ministers, that neither his Ministers in Belgium nor the Belgian Parliament have any more to say in the matter than the United States has. I think that some of our friends in Belgium would resent the question being asked. I know something of this Congo question, but I cannot say anything, nor yet can America. The frontiersman everywhere is bad; in exploiting other and weaker races, no country has a clear record. [Applause.]

We had here yesterday statements and counter-statements. Well, I have had long experience of that. I was once Consul General for ten years of an African power (the South African Republic), and heard statements made that were utterly unfounded and that finally brought about a great war. I cannot believe all the statements made by the various Methodist and Baptist missionaries in the Congo Free State, but I do think that the only proper solution is the one suggested here — that the powers which gave and entrusted to the king of the Belgians this authority should inquire whether it is being rightly used or not. [Applause.] When we gave to our East India Company the right to govern India we had a Commission of Inquiry every twenty years, and I think it is very valuable that all these chartered companies should have their acts reviewed every ten or twenty years. I think the solution here proposed is a very wise one — that we should apply to the powers who entrusted the king of the Belgians with this terrible responsibility, for a Commission of Inquiry to see whether the king and the government he has appointed have carried out the conditions of the treaty. If he has not done this, then let the powers take back from him the right that they gave him. I hope that the result will be for the benefit of the poor people who, it is claimed, have been so long terrorized and misgoverned. [Applause.]

DR. DARBY: The question as to which the point is raised is not vital to our report. Anticipating this, I intimated that the vital thing is the last question to be propounded. I find myself in sympathy with Dr. Clark, and for myself and for my friends on the Committee I have great pleasure in withdrawing the second question.

HENRI LA FONTAINE: I am a Republican and a Socialist and so do not care a whit for King Leopold. My opinion is that the true way is to say to King Leopold, "You are our trustee." But in my opinion all the countries that have colonies are the trustees of the world. [Applause.] If you say here in this affair that you must have a Commission of Inquiry in regard to the doings of King Leopold, you must also say that the powers have authority to make inquiry against all the countries that have colonies. Colonization from now on must be organized by all the peoples and not by one man.

What is said against King Leopold is not more terrible than what is said against all peoples who have colonies. Here in America the territories of the Indians have been taken from them. The papers show how a hundred thousand Americans invaded Oklahoma and the territory was taken from the Indians. That is history.

We must confess also that what has happened in the Congo is not so terrible as has been said. We have grave charges against our king, but it is not possible to say that he has taken the territories of the natives. The territories that were taken were territories where nobody lived; they were forests without population. It seems to me that the government has the right to hold territories that are without a master and without population. That is the law, the general law in all countries. So it seems that what has been said here against the administration of the Congo is much exaggerated. I myself am not against the Commission of Inquiry, but it ought to be a general law that in future all colonization shall be amenable to international law.

Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood: May I correct Mr. La Fontaine in one particular? The government bought the land of the Indians. I was one of the attorneys for the Chickasaws. The invasion was of the land of the United States, and not of the land of the Indians.

The Chairman then put the resolution as amended and it was unanimously adopted.

Dr. Darby: A resolution which was referred to the Committee regarding the undesirability of neutrals making loans to or otherwise assisting belligerents was handed over to Commission B, as being beyond the purview of our Committee. I have therefore only one point more to lay before you.

The various points of the report of the International Peace Bureau at Berne have been covered by resolutions adopted by the Congress, with one exception; that is, the reference to the various treaties that have been adopted during the past year. We propose a very simple resolution covering that point which will not require any discussion, for the sake of the completion of our report.

The resolution presented by Dr. Darby was found to be very similar to the one on arbitration treaties reported by Committee B and adopted in the early part of the Congress, and it was decided to incorporate it with that resolution, which has been done.

The Chairman: This is the conclusion of the work of Committee A. Committee B, on questions of international law, juridical subjects, etc., now has a brief report to present.

Mr. Alexander: On behalf of Committee B I have simply to propose a resolution referring the subject of Neutralization to the Berne Bureau for the ensuing year, so that I need not make any explanation. The resolution is as follows:

> "The question whether it would not be possible materially to limit the ravages of war by extending to other portions of the world the principle of neutrality already applied to certain territories and navigable waters is referred to the Berne Bureau, which is requested to present a report on the subject to a future Congress."

Mr. Erving Winslow of Boston was then introduced, and read the following paper on Neutralization.

NEUTRALIZATION.

Neutralization of nations by their own act and by treaty between the great powers means the establishment, not of methods to bring about peace, but of peace itself, the beginning of a genuine crystallizing process, self-expanding and progressive. Arbitration assumes difficulties which may lead to war. It may be sought or in many cases avoided at will. Neutralization implies the noble abandonment of that sovereign right which permits of war. Its authority is the pledge of the nations, guaranteed by enlightened public sentiment.

As has been pointed out by writers on international law, neutrality is the creation of the world of Christianity. For the word neutrality the Latin and the Greek have no equivalent. The heathen nations knew nothing but the inveterate exercise of an all-embracing warfare. The idea of limiting the horrors of war, to the contending forces by the abstention of neutrals, was the product of the new life that was developed by the Renaissance. The statesmen and the lawyers of that time invented for the characterization of the new principle "neutralis" and "neutralitas," linguistic barbarisms, interesting because they prove its novelty. Even in Machiavelli's day the precept of the Florentine seems to have been generally accepted, that a state should never be neutral, because, as he argued, in case the combatants were strong the neutral would become a prey of the conqueror, and in case they were weak the neutral would forego the opportunity to dominate its victorious ally.

Many persons in the United States have considered the possibility of the alienation sooner or later of the Philippine Islands, and the subject of neutralization has naturally suggested itself as a means of discharging such responsibility as the United States may have incurred there, and has therefore been examined and discussed. It is interesting at this time to note the fact that the United States, first admitted to the counsels of the great powers at Geneva, whatever opinion may be entertained of her participation, began to use her influence toward the neutralization of weaker peoples at the Berlin West African Congress, where Mr. John A. Kasson, in behalf of the United States, strongly and impressively urged the neutralization of the territories comprised in the conventional basin of the Congo. He instanced with great effect the distress which had been caused in this continent, during the earlier period of its settlement, by foreign wars, and made a deep impression upon the congress, which declined, however, most unfortunately in the light of recent events, to enter into a compact which might in case of war deprive the belligerent of the means of attack, only embodying the principle by way of a somewhat futile suggestion to the parties which might be concerned in a future act of war.

A nation set apart and neutralized is bound, as the authorities assert, "to avoid in times of peace every engagement which might prevent its observing the duties of neutrality in time of war." As an independent state it may lawfully exercise in its intercourse with other states all the other attributes of external sovereignty. It may form treaties of amity and even of alliance with other states, provided it does not thereby incur obligations which, though presumably lawful in time of peace, would prevent its fulfilling the duties of neutrality in time of war. Under this distinction, treaties of offensive alliance applicable to a specific case of war between any two or more powers, or guaranteeing their possessions, are of course interdicted to the presumably neutral state, but this interdict does not extend to defensive alliances formed with other neutral states for the maintenance of neutrality of the contracting parties against any power by which it might be threatened with violation.

So far for definitions. What is the history of neutralization? As is so often the case, in this matter overruling Providence has used the wickedness of man as the means by which good came to pass. We must not fear to acknowledge that good is often apparently thus promoted by evil, albeit we are so old-fashioned as to believe that we may not do evil that good may come. Heaven may make the drunken man more useful as a warning than he could have been as an example. Members of a Peace Congress cannot hear with patience the name of Bonaparte. Yet from Bonaparte's career of ambition and bloodshed there sprung the principle and the practice of neutralization. The nations of the world, after the fall of the despot, fixed barriers, places for perpetual peace, set between them, which, instead of being highways for contending armies, might be like walls of protection from aggression and spoliation.

Although the delimitations of territory as set out in the Final Act, produced June 9, 1815,—which resulted from the Treaty of Paris, May 30, 1814,—have been mostly set aside and the map of Europe almost entirely remade, the policy of neutralization which was then established has been adhered to by the other congresses.

By the Treaty of Paris, May 30, 1814, the limits of France were reëstablished as they had existed in 1792, with some augmentation on the eastern frontier.

By a separate and secret article of this treaty the disposal of the territories renounced by France in the open treaty and the relations tending to produce a system of real and durable equilibrium in Europe were to be decided upon by the allied powers among themselves. Thus, while the Treaty of Paris was made between France, England, Russia, Prussia and Austria, the pacificatory and restorative measures were retained by the allied four great powers. France was to have no vote in the coming council, but, in fact, the adroit audacity of Talleyrand and the disagreement of the allies at the Congress of Vienna secured for France a prominent position of influence.

Conforming to the secret article of the Treaty of Paris, the Congress of Vienna convened in 1814, and after months of discussion produced on June 9, 1815, the Final Act. Eight powers composed the congress — Great Britain, Russia, Austria, Prussia, France, Spain, Portugal and Sweden, France having no vote.

This congress sat from November 1, 1814, to June 11, 1815; Spain refused to sign the Final Act; Russia's claims upon Poland created a disagreement among the powers, as did the claims of Prussia upon a part of the same territory, and upon the Rhine Provinces; the reëntry of Napoleon into France dismayed, but at the same time united the allies, and caused him to be placed under the ban of Europe; a new compact was made among the four great powers with many accessories. The Battle of Waterloo in June finally crushed Napoleon, and the congress in the flush of the great victory agreed upon the Final Act.

The relations of Switzerland were determined by a declaration of the powers forming the conference dated March 20, 1815, by the act of accession of the cantons of the same date, and by the Final Act. Switzerland by these acts and declarations was to take the relation of perpetual neutrality, and in order to secure this end the better, a treaty with the King of Sardinia of May 15, 1815, provides that the Provinces of Chablais and Faucigny, south of Lake Leman, and all of Savoy north of Ugines, shall assume the same neutral attitude. Thus Switzerland, Chablais, Faucigny and all Savoy north of Ugines were made neutral. This position of Switzerland, so constituted in 1815, has never been changed; the other powers have always respected its neutrality, and it has been perpetually neutral.

The reasons assigned for the position were (1) the welfare of the minor states mentioned and (2) the peace of Europe. Switzerland furnishes pathways for the armies between France and Italy, which, being neutralized, contribute to the permanency of peace. In the case of Savoy, however, it must be regretfully noted that the gain for peace was supinely allowed to be lost. It was sacrificed by a plebiscite and the consent of Sardinia in 1860 to the greed of the Brummagen Bonaparte, the nephew of his uncle, who prolonged upon the earth the Corsican's shadow, and the powers did not heed the protest of the Swiss Federation, although parties to the original compact.

Holland and Belgium were united by the congress. They were disrupted in 1830, and by the Treaty of London, April 19, 1839, between Holland and the five great powers, — Great Britain, Russia, France, Austria and Prussia, — the Kingdom of Belgium was formed and the condition of perpetual neutrality imposed upon it. This condition was imposed that the kingdom might be a barrier between the rivals, France and Germany.

The Dutch United Provinces, with the larger part of the Austrian Netherlands, were constituted by the congress into a Kingdom of the Netherlands, under the Prince of Orange-Nassau, to which the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and a part of the Duchy of Bouillon were added.

By the Treaty of April 19, 1839, or rather the Act annexed to that treaty, the boundaries of the Duchy of Luxemburg as constituted by the Council of Vienna in 1815 were changed. A part of the old territory of Luxemburg was taken from the Kingdom of the Netherlands and annexed to the Duchy of Limbourg which had been attached to the Duchy of Luxemburg.

By the London Treaty of May 11, 1867, between the great powers, — Great Britain, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Prussia and Russia, — the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg was made an open city (Ville Ouverte) and perpetually neutral. By this treaty the *status quo ante* of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg was restored; that is to say, that part of the Duchy of Luxemburg which by the Treaty of 1839 had been given to the Kingdom of Belgium was restored to Luxemburg; and the Duchy of Limbourg reverted to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

All parties to this treaty agreed to respect the neutrality of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. Luxemburg on her part agreed to disarm and dismantle the frontier and all other forts within her boundaries, the provision of neutrality rendering them unnecessary. The city of Luxemburg was to cease being a fortified city, the Grand Duke of Luxemburg, however, being permitted to keep a stated body of troops for the police protection of his own subjects. Prussia agreed to withdraw all troops which had previously been maintained within the boundaries of Luxemburg. The Grand Duke of Luxemburg was to take all necessary steps, by virtue of his position as Grand Duke, to carry into effect the provisions of the treaty, and to convert the city of Luxemburg from an armed to an open city.

In 1870, during the Franco-Prussian War, Prussia complained that France had violated the neutrality of Luxemburg. This caused much discussion and correspondence, but the treaty of neutralization was not, however, denounced by Prussia. Since that time the neutrality of Luxemburg has been respected by all the powers. Cracow was neutralized under the great Treaty of 1815 and declared to be a perpetually free, independent and neutral state under the joint protection of Austria, Prussia and Russia, but under the claim that she had not fulfilled her obligations she lost her liberties in 1846.

The tendency to absorb the smaller and weaker nations and to colonize or to acquire spheres of influence by way of expansion is not in the line of progress toward the peace of the world. The process is almost invariably carried on through bloodshed and is followed by the deterioration or the extinction of the native inhabitants, while the power and pride of the great nations are magnified by the acquisition and their national and commercial rivalries are intensified. The Monroe Doctrine of the United States has been openly challenged in consequence of our entrance into the Eastern hemisphere, and is in danger of being interpreted as implying a protectorate of the South American governments or of being disavowed by the great powers, in case peaceful relations are strained, as a doctrine which we asserted for our own supposed advantage, and which has never been accepted by them.

Neutralization is a reasonable and practical method of availing ourselves of existing conditions, unlike many peace movements which design plans for a beautiful machinery whose working presupposes a converted world and a sublimely elevated public opinion. Reformers may be in the best sense opportunists. The peace movement need not scruple to avail itself of the jealousy of the nations concerning territory which each anxiously covets, yet perhaps still more anxiously desires to keep from others, by persistently urging that they should agree to leave it to itself under the ægis of a joint guaranty. How impressive would be the example of the prosperity and progress of the Philippines and their people, benefiting by the advantages which the civilization of the more advanced nations would offer in exchange for the opportunities freely furnished for the development of their resources by foreign capital and commercial exchanges, — opportunities sought in generous competition by the world! Freed from the burdens of a military establishment and favored by the security of a guaranteed and lasting peace, the islands would be irresistible object lessons and effect in a generation more than the eloquence of the idealist is likely to effect in centuries of pleading for the general and voluntary abrogation of this element of sovereignty among the great powers.

Why should not the United States in setting the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent, use its good offices to negotiate a treaty with the other great powers, adding the islands to the list of those fortunate countries that are forever freed from the peril of foreign war and foreign conquest?

Whether the next step toward neutralization comes from the initiation of a great power like the United States or eventuates from the counsels of some general congress called for the adjustment of the territorial problems which arise at the conclusion of great wars, the event must be hailed with enthusiasm by lovers of peace everywhere, and among the results of an assembly like this there can be none more important than the propagation of the idea among the friends of humanity.

As the illustrious Whewell long ago asserted, with the increasing difficulty of war, the safety of the world lies in making neutrality easy, neutrality "the true road to a perpetual peace."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

British and Foreign State Papers. 1835-1839. Vol. XXVII.
London: Printed by Harrison & Sons, 1856. xvi., 1433 pp. 8vo.
Treaty between Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia, on the one part, and the Netherlands on the other, relative to the Netherlands and Belgium. Signed at London, April 19, 1839. Pp. 990-1002.

Calvo, Charles.
Le Droit international théorique et pratique. Tome IV.
Paris: Arthur Rousseau, 1896. xxviii., (1), 630 pp. 8vo.
Etat de neutralité, pp. 407-566.

Descamps, Ed.
La neutralité de la Belgique au point de vue historique, diplomatique, juridique et politique.
Bruxelles: F. Larcier, 1902. (2), x, 639 pp. 8vo.

Dollot, René.
Les origines de la neutralité de la Belgique et le système de la barrière (1609-1830).
Paris: Félix Alcan, 1902. xxv, (1), 570 pp. Colored map. 8vo.

Hertslet, Edward.
The map of Europe by treaty; showing the various political and territorial changes which have taken place since the general peace of 1814.
London: Butterworths, 1875. 3 vols. 8vo.
Declaration of the eight powers on the affairs of the Helvetic confederacy. Signed at Vienna, 20th March, 1815. Vol. 1, pp. 64-69.
Treaty . . . relative to the separation of Belgium from Holland. Signed at London, 15th November, 1831. Vol. 2, pp. 858-871.

Treaty . . . relative to the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and the Duchy of Limburg. Signed at London, 11th May, 1867. Vol. 3, pp. 1801–1806.
Treaty . . . on part of the Netherlands. Signed at London, 19th April, 1839. Vol. 2, pp. 979–998.
Le Grand Duché de Luxembourg et le Traité de Londres, May 11, 1867.

Lawrence, T. J.
The principles of international law.
Boston, U. S. A.: D. C. Heath & Co. xxi, (1), 645 pp. 8vo.
The law of neutrality, pp. 473–636.

McCrackan, W. D.
The rise of the Swiss republic. A history.
Boston, Mass.: Arena Publishing Co., 1892. 413 pp. Colored map. 8vo.

Nye, Ernest.
Etudes de droit international et de droit politique. Deuxième série.
Bruxelles: Alfred Castaigne, 1901. viii., 340 pp. 8vo.
Notes sur la neutralité, pp. 47–163.

Thonissen, J. J.
La neutralité belge dans le système Européen.
In Patria Belgica, encyclopédie nationale ou exposé méthodique de toutes les connaissances relatives à la Belgique, deuxième partie, pp. 367–380. Bruxelles, 1873. 4to.

Wheaton, Henry.
Elements of international law. Fourth English edition.
London: Stevens & Sons, 1904. xxxv, (1), 848 pp. 8vo.

History of the law of nations.
Sessional papers of the House of Commons.
Murkard's nouveau recueil. Suppl. 1, 329.
Martens U. S. 2, 379, Martens & Cussy, 3, 62.
Martens U. S. 2, 157; 2, 175; 11, 390.

Mr. Alexander: May I just say that I am not at all in favor of sending to the Berne Bureau unnecessary questions, for it is a body having a great deal of work to do on our behalf? But this question of Neutralization seems to me to need careful inquiry before the Congress can deal with it, and therefore it is a question which is rightly sent to the Bureau to study.

The resolution to send the question of Neutralization to the Berne Bureau to report on was carried unanimously.

The Chairman: I now have the privilege of presenting to you Mr. J. Prudhommeaux of Nîmes, a distinguished French sociologist and Secretary of the *Association de le Paix par le Droit*, who has a report to make by appointment from a previous congress on the economic causes of war. Mr. Smith will afterwards give you in English the substance of what M. Prudhommeaux says.

ADDRESS OF MR. J. PRUDHOMMEAUX.

(INTERPRETED BY MR. SMITH.)

Mr. Prudhommeaux explains that at the Congress of Glasgow in 1901 a commission, or permanent committee, was appointed to study the economic causes of war; that Frederic Passy of France, a representative from Russia and one from Great Britain, with Mr. Prudhommeaux himself, constituted this commission, and that he is the only representative of that committee present at this Congress. On behalf of the committee that has studied the economic causes of war he has proposed the following resolution, which he read clause by clause, and discussed the clauses as he read them.

The first clause of the resolution is to this effect:

> *Whereas,* The wars in the past have had as their profound cause the antagonism of economic interests, either of monarchs or of peoples.

He said that this cause of war could be traced back to the time of the ancient Greeks, who were accustomed to attack the towns on the Mediterranean for the sake of plunder. Later on efforts were made to satisfy material appetites by fanciful allusions to the "honor" of the conflict and such things, but it is easy to demonstrate that the desire for material gain was at the bottom of the acts of aggression.

The second clause is to the following effect:

> *Whereas,* Since the middle of the nineteenth century wars have assumed more particularly the character of hasty and brutal appropriation by the industrially and commercially powerful nations of the still unexploited markets of the world.

He points out that the Opium War might be considered as a turning point in the modern development of these wars, which are even more economic in their cause than were those in ancient history. Thus we have wars for the opening up of Asia and Africa, and if we should go to the bottom of the Russo-Japanese War we should find that economic interests were the real cause of it, that it was felt that new markets must be secured. Why is this rivalry taking place, the rivalry in which developed people persist in throwing themselves upon primitive peoples? He says the reason of this is that at home there is not rapid enough consumption of the goods that are produced. In a word, there is over-production, or glutted markets; hence the necessity of finding foreign markets, and if need be taking them by force. The reason for the demand for these foreign markets is, that the income of most people is so small that the community has not the purchasing power for the goods produced. And the reason for this is the gross abuse of capitalism in the distribution of wealth throughout the community. [Applause.] So that, as capitalism produces more than can be consumed at home, capitalism wants to attack other countries and open up other markets. This over-production produces gluts in the market, and then the consumer has no means of enabling the producer to know what he wants to consume. Hence we have the extravagance of the modern advertising system; in fact, we have a state of anarchy in our methods of industrial production. And the war to acquire new markets and colonies is a war waged in order to maintain economic anarchy at home.

The third clause of the resolution is:

> *Whereas,* If international conflicts are to be regulated, as they should be, in a

friendly way by the better organization of relations among peoples, and if, furthermore, these conflicts are to be prevented by an effort to reconcile human interests, individual as well as collective.

In regard to this clause he says that it is very good indeed to have a tribunal at The Hague, and all manner of juridical methods for solving quarrels as they arise, but the great thing is to prevent such quarrels from arising. And he says that, while the cause of quarrels remains endemic among the civilized and commercial peoples of the world, even though you have all manner of tribunals and treaties, there will be a moment when the economic anxiety will be so keen that all your grand principles will be flung to the winds, and nations will go to war with each other so as to secure the means of existence. In other words, " Hunger knows no law." That is a brief summary of his argument. Therefore he insists that we must have preventive measures in regard to war, and the only way to prevent war is to remove its principal cause, namely, its economic cause.

So he comes to the fourth point of the resolution :

The Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress declares that it is the duty of the friends of peace to study with the greatest care all economic and social movements (trades unionism, coöperation, trusts, etc.) which tend to the realization, unconsciously and sometimes even against the will of their promoters, of a more rational organization of production, of consumption and exchange.

In reference to this he insists that human interests are in antagonism with each other. If you go to the shop and buy something, there is an antagonism between the interest of the person who buys and that of the person who sells; there is an antagonism between the interest of the employer and the employed; there is an antagonism on all sides. In other words, class war exists right here in our midst. [Applause.] Now the forming of trades unions, of coöperative societies, the creation of socialistic movements are all great collective or organized efforts on the part of human beings to try to put an end to this class war. [Applause.] We cannot discuss these movements here; it would take hours and days to enter into the details of them; but if you are sincere in your desire to prevent war, you must study these questions. The socialistic movement, the trades union movement, the trust movement, may unconsciously be bringing about the better, the more rational organization of production, and may be the means of solving the economic question for the future. [Applause.] All such efforts tend to peace, and without such efforts as these your labors will not be likely to be very fruitful; for you cannot do much against the law of necessity, and when hunger speaks your principles are likely to vanish.

He therefore proposes that this matter be referred to the Berne Bureau, not of course for the Bureau to report on trades unionism, on trusts, or on socialism, but to try to establish the connecting links between these problems and the peace movement. [Applause.]

So the last clause of the resolution is:

And entrusts the Berne Bureau with the duty of collecting as complete information as possible on those questions, so far as they are related to the problem of international pacification.

MR. DANIEL OFFORD of Mt. Lebanon, N. Y.: *Mr. Chairman:* Will you kindly allow me to say that I think we shall all find that one of the great reasons why we have not had peace on the earth before this time is because all the governments of so-called Christendom have excluded women from their rights and from a part in the government? [Applause.] If we want to have permanent peace upon the earth we must institute a congress composed of men and women alike, that shall represent all the nations; and in every nation a small congress composed of men and women that shall stand as watchmen to see when a threatening controversy is arising, that it may be referred to the great congress of nations, and thus avert the breaking out of war.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I say for Mr. Offord's information, if he does not know it already, that in our Peace Congresses women have the same rights as men, if they will only claim them?

MISS WILHELMINA SHERIFF–BAIN, of Taranaki, New Zealand: I should simply like to state for the information of this Congress that the argument of Mr. Prudhommeaux, so beautifully interpreted for us by Mr. Smith, is contained in substance in a book written by Michael Flürscheim, entitled "Clue to the Economic Labyrinth." This book was published in New Zealand, and I recommend it as one of the best books on this subject that has ever been written.

REV. AMANDA DEYO: I only wanted to say that I am sure we all know that in this Universal Peace Congress women have stood side by side with the men.

REV. CHARLES F. DOLE: We wish that Mr. Smith, the translator, would read the resolution offered by Mr. Prudhommeaux in English, so that we may have it all together.

The resolution in English was read as follows:

Whereas, The wars of the past have had as their profound cause the antagonism of economic interests either of monarchs or of peoples; and

Whereas, Since the middle of the nineteenth century wars have assumed more particularly the character of a hasty and brutal appropriation, by the industrially or commercially powerful nations, of the still unexploited markets of the world; and

Whereas, If international conflicts are to be regulated, as they should be, in a friendly way, by the better organization of relations among peoples, and if, furthermore, as is still more important, these conflicts are to be prevented by an effort to reconcile human interests, individual as well as collective;

The Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress declares that it is the duty of the friends of peace to study with the greatest care all economic and social movements (trades unionism, coöperation, trusts, etc.) which tend to the realization, unconsciously and sometimes even against the will of their promoters, of a more rational organization of production, consumption and exchange;

And entrusts the Berne Bureau with the duty of collecting as complete information as possible on these questions, so far as they are related to the problem of international pacification.

REV. CHARLES F. DOLE: The reason I wanted the resolution read was just to call attention to a question of wording which I believe the gentleman who introduced the resolution will be willing to change. I think it should be distinctly understood that this economic rivalry does not seem to a good many of us to be on the part of the many, but of the few. It is not the hunger of the people that makes war, but the hunger of the few for money. [Applause.] It seems to me that the people are wonderfully quiet; it is the few who make the trouble, and that should be carefully brought out in the wording.

MR. SMITH: I may say that the word "hunger" is not used in the French, but I used it in order to get over using a long sentence.

REV. CHARLES F. DOLE: I wonder if also, in the second paragraph, instead of the word "nations" could be put in the words "those managing the governments of the nations." The nations have not spoken on these subjects; they have never had a chance to speak; it is the groups of men managing the governments of the nations that make the trouble. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: It has developed in our Congresses that very often it is not the governments only, but the people also, who make the wars. It is quite well known that recently wars have been, if not caused, at least backed by the people in more than one country. It may be as well, therefore, to leave the wording as it is.

The resolution was then unanimously adopted.

EDWIN D. MEAD: I have received from Mr. Perris a letter from Sir John Macdonell, Professor of Comparative Law in University College, London, who was at the last moment prevented from being with us. This letter contains written suggestions of the highest importance, so important that I shall place the letter in the hands of the Secretary, for whatever use it may be possible to make of it. (See Appendix.)

May I take a moment here to say a word which I should have been glad to say yesterday when it was settled that this Congress should meet next summer in Lucerne? I wish to remind you American delegates that for this Congress in the United States more than one hundred of our European friends have crossed the ocean. I trust we shall see to it that in the Congress next year not less than two hundred and fifty delegates from the United States shall be present. I hope that every one of you will make your plans early, and communicate with the American Peace Society in Boston.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was one subject on our program on which the Committee have made no report; that is, "The Education of Those Entering Diplomatic Careers in the Principles and History of Arbitration." The subject will therefore have to go over for consideration by a future congress.

David Greene Haskins, Jr.: The resolution which I desire to offer is merely supplementary to the excellent report presented by Commission C, and it is offered now with the consent and approval of Mrs. Mead, the Chairman of that Committee:

Resolved, That the International Peace Bureau at Berne be requested by this Congress to represent to the various patriotic societies in the several countries our sense of the great and peculiar opportunity which is open to them to do a mighty service to their respective nations, as well as for humanity, and to request their powerful and permanent coöperation, along such lines as may seem to them best, in the work of interesting and educating the people of those countries in the cause of International Arbitration and Peace.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood: I have the honor of presenting a resolution that an American Committee be appointed by this Congress to act with the Bureau at Berne to raise a fund and to try to carry out the recommendations of Committee C adopted by the Congress, referring to the subject of propaganda. I also desire to state that the Universal Alliance of Women for Peace, with headquarters in Paris, sends its greetings to this Congress, and makes an appeal to all the friends of peace to unite their efforts in creating in all important parts of the world centres (*foyers*) for the study of the great problems of peace and for active work in promoting the cause; such centres of propaganda as were referred to in the report of Committee C. The resolution I have to offer is as follows:

Resolved, That an American Committee be appointed by the President of this Congress to act in conjunction with the International Peace Bureau at Berne in raising a fund for peace propaganda and to carry out, so far as they may deem practicable, the recommendations of the report of Committee C referring to this subject adopted by this Congress.

Mr. G. H. Perris: I should like to say that this outcome of the present Congress is an assurance that the Congress is not going to end in a whiff of smoke. It is an assurance that those who have worked for this Congress will now work for a permanent movement worthy of the American people. I hope that this Fund for Propaganda will be as great a success as the cause demands and is worthy of, both here and in the Old World. [Applause.]

L'Abbe Pichot (interpreted by Mr. Smith): L'Abbé Pichot desires to say that, while welcoming the creation of an American Committee to raise a fund, he is anxious that the previous organization, that of the Berne Bureau, which was invited by the Rouen Congress to create such a fund, should be maintained in its integrity, and that the new committee, if organized, may coöperate in the heartiest way with the Bureau.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. William Barnes, Sr., of Albany, New York, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the International Peace Congress convened in Boston, Mass.,

U. S. A., respectfully recommend the passage by the Congress of the United States of the following resolution:

> *Resolved*, By the Senate and House of Representatives that the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, authorized and instructed to collect and compile, from the most authentic and reliable sources, statistics on the following subjects, and have the same printed and bound on or before January 1, 1906:
>
> First: The cost of wars in all countries from the year 1800 down to date, including the expenses of the nation, states, municipalities and otherwise.
>
> Second: The amount paid for pensions and other allowances to soldiers and sailors engaged in such wars.
>
> Third: The amount paid for hospitals and retreats for disabled soldiers and sailors.
>
> Fourth: The amount of property destroyed in such wars on land and sea.
>
> Fifth: The additional cost of maintaining armies and navies in time of peace to each nation during said period.
>
> Sixth: An approximate estimate of the indirect expenses and damages by such wars to the health and property of each nation resulting from such wars.
>
> Seventh: The number of killed and wounded and disabled on each side during said wars.
>
> Said statistics to be classified under the name of each nation and to be summarized in the most plain and concise manner practicable. On completion said volume to be distributed in the discretion of Congress in this and other countries as preliminary to an International Peace and Disarmament Congress to be held at Washington or The Hague, July 4, 1906, or sooner if practicable.

Resolved, That the Secretary of this Congress be instructed to send certified copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States and to the Secretaries of State and Commerce and Labor, and to the Hon. Richard Bartholdt of St. Louis, President of the Interparliamentary Union, and that Mr. Bartholdt be requested to urge the passage of the above resolution by the Senate and the House of Representatives and their approval by the President, Theodore Roosevelt.

MR. SMITH: I am asked by L'Abbé Pichot to tell the Conference that what the resolution of Mr. Barnes asks for is what the Republic of Monaco is already doing.

MR. JOSHUA L. BAILY: I want to propose a verbal amendment. Instead of saying "by the President, Theodore Roosevelt," say "the President of the United States."

The amendment was accepted and the resolution adopted.

MR. THOMAS WRIGHT of Bedford, England: I beg to present the following resolution:

Resolved, That while this Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress hopes that by the operation of the Hague Court of Arbitration wars may be averted in the future, the Congress feels strongly that steps should be taken by the civilized governments to safeguard the interests of weak nations and native races, that all who have dealings with them may act strictly on the lines of justice and righteousness.

Some objection was made to this resolution as repeating the action taken previously by the Congress, but it was adopted.

Mr. W. R. Cremer: *Ladies and Gentlemen:* I shall not inflict a speech upon the audience at this the eleventh hour of our meeting. The resolution which I am going to submit for your consideration, and for what I am certain will be your unanimous adoption, is a vote of thanks to the Committee on Organization, to the Chairman and the Secretary, and to the people of Boston.

I have been asked by my friends to move this resolution, which they feel quite certain will meet with your cordial and unanimous approval. Since our arrival in the city of Boston we have been entertained, if I may use such an expression, right royally by the people of the city. The work of organization which the Committee had to perform, and in which they have been actively engaged for several months, must have been a most Herculean task. The way they have discharged their duties and the result of their long sustained efforts have been apparent to us in the proceedings of the Congress since we assembled last Monday. The resolution is as follows:

> The Congress extends its cordial congratulations to the Organizing Committee, and especially to its Chairman and Secretary, upon the remarkable success of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, and thanks them most warmly for their generous efforts, to which that success is largely due.
>
> The delegates desire also to place on record their sincere acknowledgments of the careful arrangements made for their comfort, and their gratitude for the unexampled hospitality shown to them by the Organizing Committee and by the people of Boston.

No words of mine are necessary to commend that resolution to your consideration and your unanimous support.

Mr. Herbert Burrows: I have the greatest possible pleasure in seconding this resolution, for two reasons. The first is because I believe I am the one of the foreign delegates who has known our dear friend and co-worker, Edwin D. Mead, for the greatest number of years. We could not go to our respective countries without in the heartiest and the sincerest manner giving him our thanks, and also joining with him Mrs. Mead, for the cordial way in which they have received us. Thirty years ago Mead and I were fellow-students in England, at the University of Cambridge. We were then young men with the world before us, and to-day we bridge over these thirty years from Cambridge in England to Boston in America.

The larger reason why I second this resolution is because of the way in which you Boston people, and I believe through you the American people, have treated the foreign delegates. [Applause.] You have got an illimitable country, and bigger than your illimitable space is the heart of the Boston people. [Applause.] I sincerely hope that next year you will bring with you your hearts in your bodies and help us at Lucerne.

I will say no more, except this: During this week I have saturated myself with your Revolutionary Boston. As an English Republican I was glad to stand on your Revolutionary landmarks. We bridge over to-day from the unfortunate enmity of the past between your country and mine, — we bridge over four generations, and on this platform we emphasize that fraternal, heartfelt bond between the nations which never more shall be broken if we can help it. [Applause.]

There is no such word as "fail" in this peace business. Garrison did not fail after all, when he was dragged through your streets. Burns, when he was taken down to the water front guarded by Massachusetts troops, did not fail, humble slave as he was. We cannot fail in this work, and if we are true to ourselves we shall live to see the day when the master spirit of humanity shall gather up the discords of humanity and form them into one anthem of truth and justice and peace. [Applause.]

BARONESS VON SUTTNER: When I heard this resolution announced, I felt it a most joyful duty to second it. I need not repeat any of the words which have been said about our Organization Committee, because you all agree with me that the Conference has been organized in an admirable way.

What I wish to speak of is the moral success of the Congress to which you all have contributed, — the atmosphere of sympathy that we have found. I have found it a grand feature of this Congress, and I hope it will also be a feature of future ones. Our platform has become a tribune for all oppressed and all suffering people. [Applause.] All may come freely here and speak, even if we cannot help them; they can be heard, and that is what suffering people want. The suffering peoples are dumb, and we give them a chance to be heard. The Armenians and the Africans and the Jews, all people who suffer, can come here and make their complaints. And we can second these complaints with our accusations. We can speak to those who are guilty of those oppressions. And then we not only address ourselves to those who are oppressed and to those who cause the oppression, but also to those who have so much apathy. Everything which is evil in the world is continuing because there is so much apathy.

I thank you all with my whole heart, and in returning to my country I shall carry them a lesson from this capital of American intellect, Boston. [Applause.]

PROFESSOR T. H. RUYSSEN (interpreted by Mr. Smith): Delegate Ruyssen, while not desirous of retaining the Congress, feels himself in duty bound to say a few words on behalf of the French delegation, to thank you for the very special form of hospitality you have afforded them in this country. He alluded more particularly to the fact that you had spared them as strangers the dullness of hotel life. He explains that in the French language the word "home" does not exist, but this English and American word has been introduced into the French language and they do sometimes speak of "home." Well, you have accorded them the extraordinary privilege of living here in Boston and seeing what American homes are like. And after the nightmare of the hurry and scurry on your trains and in your streets, above and below ground, the delicious quiet of the American home has been highly appreciated. [Applause.]

You have also enabled them to learn more than they could possibly have done in the Congress what American women are like in the best phase of their life. [Applause.] He has inspected many schools and colleges for the education of girls and women, but he has seen here the superior results which come from the American manner of bringing up women. He considers that the Congress owes its success, to a large extent, to the support of women, and on behalf of the French delegation he extends his cordial thanks to all Americans, but more especially to the American ladies. [Applause.]

SIGNOR E. T. MONETA (interpreted by Mr. Smith): The Italian delegate on behalf of Italy adds one word. He came here with great expectations, but the realization has exceeded anything he had hoped for. He has breathed here everywhere the breath of fraternity, of solidarity, of peace. In other countries they have met with individual sympathy, with societies and delegates that sympathized with them, but here it is not alone the Congress, it is the whole people of America, it is your President, it is the government, it is the people in the streets. On all sides people seem to be favorable to the cause of peace. This has been for him a great lesson, a helpful example, and he will return to his own country to continue the work for the cause of peace, much strengthened and encouraged by the knowledge of the unanimous support and approval he has met with in this country. [Applause.]

SENATOR HENRI LA FONTAINE: I come from a very small country, and I will make a very small speech to you, to thank you very heartily for all that has been done for us.

I wish to say a word as to my general impression after a month's journey in your country. It seems to me that America is a country of peace,— peace between the classes, and peace between the races also. I have remarked here that all our countrymen from Europe who came over here to America — German, French, English, Belgians, — live in peace one with another. All the partitions that exist in Europe disappear here. I have been struck also by the fact that the working men here are not different from other people.

A few days ago I was invited to go to a very small meeting of Belgian working men, of our Flemish working men. They had been here in America from six months to two years, but all appeared as gentlemen. The change was very great. The atmosphere here persuades us that all spirit of class must disappear, and so that industrial peace which was discussed in the speech of M. Prudhommeaux will be obtained here. There are few great disputes between capital and the working men here. I think that the working man is on such a high plane of life that disputes of that kind will end peacefully. It seems to me that it is a great example for the world that we have seen here, the classes and the races from Europe, who are such enemies there, living together peacefully, with the possibility of producing industrial peace as well as international peace. [Applause.]

Professor Pierre Clerget (interpreted by Mr. Smith): Mr. Clerget, on behalf of the Swiss Peace Society, desires to thank you all for your touching welcome. The delicious souvenir of this Congress will never be forgotten. It has presented a unique spectacle, full of encouragement and hope.

He then went on to point out that from the international point of view Switzerland, though so small a country, was a very important country. It was there that the first great International Convention, the Convention of the Red Cross, was signed and placed on the records of humanitarian progress. It was there that a number of International Bureaus were located, there that the international postal and other conventions have been concluded for the benefit of mankind at large. And it is Switzerland that will now have the pleasure and be extremely proud and happy to receive you next year. You may be very certain that the Swiss will do their very best, and he begs to address the great Republic of America on behalf of the Republic of Switzerland, and to invite you all to the Congress to be held at Lucerne next year. [Applause.]

The resolution was then unanimously adopted.

Mr. Mead: *Mr. Cremer, Ladies and Gentlemen:* In behalf of Dr. Trueblood and the other members of the Committee as well as myself, I thank you heartily for the kind words which have here been spoken. Your best and most important thanks were in coming to the Congress in such great numbers, and in making possible in Boston and the United States a demonstration the value of which to us is incalculable.

You have been reminded, and you have reminded us, — and we thank you for it, — that we, too, have been infected, as one of our distinguished men said in this city last night, by the bacillus of militarism. Here in the United States in these last years we have felt the temptations to the subjection of weaker peoples. We have felt the temptations that go with the wretched old rivalry of militarism and the building up of a great navy. The heart of the American people in recent years has been heavy and sad, and has longed for an opportunity to express itself. And this occasion has been seized by the American people as an opportunity to make its feeling known, and there has gone up such a protest as I believe will act as a check to the spirit of militarism which has lately beset us. [Applause.]

This Peace Congress has not been simply inside the walls of the rooms where these meetings have been held. It has been going on distinctly and in a most important way in a hundred halls all over New England and all over the United States. The most important fact was the coming to us of Secretary Hay, but the second most important word was not spoken in this Congress at all. It was spoken last night by Richard Olney, who was the American actor in that great treaty between America and England which was not passed. Read Richard Olney's speech last night, and count that as a part of this Congress, and let it serve as an expression of the feeling which Americans have of the danger which besets us, and of their resolution that that danger shall be averted.

I have nothing more to say except to assure you that if we can bring it about, an American delegation such as before in this great cause has never crossed the ocean shall cross next year to meet you in Lucerne. We shall hope to have in that spot which many of us consider the most beautiful spot upon the face of the earth such a Peace Congress as this world has never seen, and over that beautiful spot shall be shed the benediction of heaven. [Applause.]

An "Appeal to the Nations," such as is usually issued at the close of the International Peace Congresses, was then read by the Secretary and unanimously approved. It was as follows:

APPEAL TO THE NATIONS.

The Thirteenth International Congress of the friends of peace, held in Boston October 3 to 8, 1904, has met under unusual circumstances. On the one hand, murderous war unsurpassed in the annals of the slaughter of men by men has been and still is ravaging a section of the globe. On the other hand, the friends of peace have gathered together in their annual Congress on this side of the globe in numbers never witnessed before, after a year of unexampled progress of their cause.

The Congress has deeply felt the bitterness and irony of the situation from the one side. It has also been inspired with great hope and courage at the prospect which presents itself from the other side. The cruel war in progress between Russia and Japan — a war which might easily have been avoided if the two belligerents and the other powers signatory of the Hague Convention had faithfully kept the obligations assumed in that Convention — has made it clear that much yet remains to be done in the eradication of old race and national prejudices, false ideals of national greatness and glory, perverted conceptions of patriotism, and territorial and commercial greed.. This war has also anew demonstrated the necessity of the immediate extension and perfecting of substitutes for violence in the settlement of international controversies.

The Congress, at the conclusion of its deliberations, appeals to the peoples of all nations and of all classes to arouse themselves to a finer and more adequate conception of their relations one to another, to a deeper sense of their mutual dependence and duties, to the community of both their material and spiritual interests, and to their rights in the determination of the foreign policies pursued by their governments, that they may no longer be involved without their consent in foolish and ruinous wars with other powers or in the unjust exploitation of those whom they are bound by every consideration of righteousness and honor to assist and elevate rather than to plunder and degrade. It respectfully invites all the national sovereigns and presidents, all men in positions of public trust, all ministers of religion, all instructors of youth in schools of every grade, all the owners and conductors of both the religious and secular press, and all others who wield influence in the moulding and directing of public opinion, to throw the entire weight, not only of their personal influence, but of their positions, towards eradicating the causes of misunderstanding and conflict and the creation of such a complete system of international adjudication and such a wide reaching pacific public sentiment as will in time render the barbarous method of war impossible.

The Congress has appreciated to the full what has been done the past year in the development of pacific public opinion and in the conclusion of treaties of obligatory arbitration in Western Europe and America. It has rejoiced in particular at the large and effective support given to the cause of international arbitration and goodwill by the heads of great governments, by cabinet officials, by national legislators and other influential public men. It sees in the attitude and acts of these leaders, supported as they are by a large and rapidly increasing demand for peace among the people of all ranks, a trustworthy pledge of the early and complete triumph among the nations of the principles of friendship, justice and general peace for which the friends of peace have been so long contending. The Congress pledges the hearty sympathy and coöperation of all those in all civilized countries whom it represents, to the responsible governmental authorities into whose hands the practical carrying out of their ideals has now passed.

The Congress has this year for the first time received the full and hearty endorsement of labor, which has been ably represented in its membership. This powerful support of its principles and aims by those upon whom the whole structure of society so much depends gives to the peace propaganda a strength and assurance of success which it has never before known. It has also had the presence and coöperation in its deliberations of an unusually large number of representatives of business organizations, whose interests, now as wide as the world, are increasingly felt by them to demand general and undisturbed peace.

In its conclusions the Congress has had in view a few great practical ends, the enlargement and strengthening of pacific public opinion in all the countries of the world, the extension of the scope and authority of the Hague Court, the union of the nations in the bonds of peace through a general system of treaties of obligatory arbitration, and the creation of a regular International Congress to serve, side by side with the International Court, as the organ of the expression and the determination of the common interests of the nations and the extension among them of the reign of law now so well established within the nations themselves. It appeals with confidence to men and women of all ranks and positions in all countries to aid with whatever influence they can wield in the securing of these great purposes, through the attainment of which it feels assured that the high destiny of humanity in both its moral and material development will be swiftly and certainly reached.

Mr. Paine: And now, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress, the moment has arrived when our labors terminate. It is my duty — a sad duty — to bid you all farewell. First, however, let me, from my heart, thank all those from abroad and from home who have aided to make this Congress so successful and so influential.

When we approached the question of holding the Congress on this side of the Atlantic, and here in Boston, many of us regarded the possibility of making it a great success as almost beyond the realm of hope. We did not dare to feel confidence that so large a delegation from so many countries covering Europe and other parts of the world would gather here in Boston to make this Congress the most representative one which I believe has ever met in America. We thank you therefore. We wish we could tell you how much good influence will come from your presence, and from the inspiration and the encouragement which you have given to the American people. The cause is much stronger than when you came.

We thank the Press of Boston [applause], and the Associated Press of the country [applause], for the great interest which they have taken in the Congress and the space they have devoted to the meetings and the discussions. They have helped very powerfully, because our cause rests not upon anything that can be bought with money or that can be procured by any artificial influence; it rests upon the education of the people. [Applause]. We make our appeal to the public intelligence and the public conscience, and both more and more are becoming our supporters.

This Congress has done more than I can set forth in words to strengthen our cause on this side of the Atlantic, and therefore, ladies and gentlemen, our foreign delegates and friends, we thank you from our hearts for your presence and your aid.

When we meet in future years we hope that you will be able to recall with pleasure the efforts that we have gladly put forth here in Boston to make your stay with us enjoyable and as fruitful as possible in advancing the cause which we all have so much at heart.

We shall meet, many of us, at the Congress next year, in the beautiful city of Lucerne. I was there in July and visited with great pleasure the Peace Museum, the most interesting museum of that kind in the world, built and supported by the generous gifts of Mr. Bloch, — a wonderfully significant and instructive establishment. We shall, I know, enjoy next year and thereafter the fruits of the potent and beautiful work which you have helped us to accomplish here in Boston. [Applause.]

I now declare the deliberations of the Thirteenth International Peace Congress terminated.

On the afternoon of Saturday, after the close of the Congress, most of the European delegates made a pilgrimage to Mount Auburn Cemetery, where they laid wreaths upon the graves of Noah Worcester, William E. Channing, Charles Sumner, Henry W. Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, Oliver Wendell Holmes and Phillips Brooks, in honor of the great services rendered by these distinguished men to the cause of peace and humanity.

ADDRESS OF ALDERMAN THOMAS SNAPE.

TREMONT TEMPLE, WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 5.

[Through some unaccountable oversight this address of Hon. Thomas Snape of Liverpool, England, failed to get inserted in its proper place in the report of the session of Wednesday evening, October 5.]

Mr. Lincoln, Ladies and Gentlemen: The form of the question with which we are to deal to-night is stated in the program as "The Special Interest and Duties of Business Men in the Peace Cause." Before I say anything about their duties I will ask permission to put the other part of the question first, and to refer to their interests, for my knowledge of business assures me that if a business man's interests conflict with his duty it is not always duty that comes out the victor. [Laughter.] If, therefore, we cannot establish the fact that the interests of business men are in the direction of peace, I am afraid that we shall spend our strength for naught in the endeavor to inculcate duties.

In the examination of those interests I may take it for granted that you will generally admit that it is an absolute necessity for the profitable use of capital — whether that capital be money or the labor of the artisan, which is his capital — that there should be confidence and security in its employment. It will be further conceded that not only the same range of customers as that to which one has been accustomed should be maintained, but that the circle of customers should be enlarged, so far as that is practicable.

Dealing with these two fundamental propositions with reference to the interests of commerce and of business men, I put the question to you whether war establishes that confidence and security which are essential to the due and profitable employment of capital, or in any sense maintains even the number of customers that we have ; whether war does not indeed diminish that number by shooting them down and blowing out their brains. [Applause.]

I might very well content myself with putting these two propositions before you, without any fear of their being successfully controverted, were it not for the fact that when depression comes over business circles, it is not an infrequent thing to hear thoughtless, I had almost said brainless, men, who consider themselves clever as business men, say that we need a good war. Is there such a thing as a "good" war? One writer has said that there never was such a thing as a good war or a bad peace; and I am not sure that that saying is too strong. Then others say that we had better fight out international troubles at once, and not have them hanging over our heads. In this connection let me quote the statement of one of our eminent statesmen now dead, who was at the head of the house of Derby and the predecessor of the present holder of the title. The late Lord Derby said that "If there must be war sooner or later, let it be later" — and so say I. [Laughter and applause.]

We know that the reason this demand for war springs up is because for a time when war has broken out a fallacious species of prosperity seems to spread through the nation. In our own city of Liverpool, at the time of the South African war, we saw freights go up, ships built in larger numbers, and a great demand on every side for shipping. Of course all the shipping people were delighted, not realizing that it was merely transitory, and they were all ready to support the continuance of the conflict to the bitter end. But what is the result to-day? There never was a time when shipping was more depressed than it is now. The South African war is over, and we find that on all hands there is a great amount of complaint in our shipping circles of Liverpool. It is the effect, always the effect, of war, that the prosperity of the moment is succeeded by a far greater and a much more prolonged depression than takes place under ordinary conditions. When war breaks out our iron works extend their borders and call for more men; our gun factories are brought into movement; our coal fields prosper, and people say, "This is a grand thing for business."

And what is the effect? Again the same result is seen: the war is over, the temporary demand is over, and the coal fields are as depressed as they can be in our country; in fact, business generally is depressed.

On the mere question of interest, therefore, I contend that business men have some duties lying near to their own advantage as to dealing with this question of peace and war.

It has been said by one of our writers that the greatest of British interests is peace; and that applies to your country and to every country of the world. But the worst of the war system is that it is not done with when a war is ended. The system is maintained and the armaments go on increasing and the demands grow continually. They are like the horse leech which cries, "Give, give," and is never satisfied. The military party are always demanding that there shall be more ironclads and more forts and more men and more expenditure, until we have reached a point in the annual expenditure of my own country that is something appalling. Other countries are doing the same thing. I won't trouble you with the figures, but they are appalling. As the French economist said: "The ogre of war costs more for his digestion than he does for his meals."

It is obvious, therefore, that war is a dreadful thing that needs to be dealt with in some way. There were two political canvassers who went out into the rural parts of my country and called at a house. A woman came to the door, and they asked her whether her husband were a Liberal or a Tory. "Oh, well," she said, "when he goes out with a Liberal and gets a drink he is a Liberal, and when he goes out with a Tory and gets a drink he is a Tory; but when he comes home in either case he is a big nuisance." [Laughter.] No matter with what government war goes out — and both Liberal and Tory governments on our side of the water are more or less tarred with this defilement of war — no matter with what government war goes out, it is an awful nuisance to the people at home who have to pay the expense.

If these interests of ours as business men are so involved, surely there ought to be a remedy. But instead of trying to find remedies, the ills of war and its prosecution are being magnified and intensified and made more horrible than ever, and we are relapsing into the condition of savagery and barbarism. I refer to those new-fangled methods of prosecuting war by means of mines, by means of explosives which blow hundreds of people into eternity in a moment.

In the old days they had the stiletto of the assassin, and they used to poison wells and then to employ dum-dum bullets. These things were banished from warfare, but we are now using worse means, for we are employing mines which are a menace to traffic. Some mines were placed in the Danube and forgotten, and twelve months afterwards they blew up a vessel filled with passengers. Then the meaning of "contraband of war" has been enlarged, and such things as coal and flour have been declared to be contraband. Unless business men raise their voices against these things, our shipping will continue to suffer even though we ourselves may not be at war, if other nations seize our vessels and carry them as prizes of war into their own ports. We see how this has taken place in the present war between Russia and Japan. We have nothing to do with it directly, but our shipping and commerce is suffering, and all because of a war with which we have no direct connection.

If we have no remedy to offer for these things, if there is nothing to oppose to these evils other than a policy of despair, then in the words of John Bright, uttered in the House of Commons in reference to another war that we were then carrying on: "Let us abandon our professions; let us no longer claim to be Christians; let us go back to heathen times since we adhere to heathen practices. Take down, at any rate, the Ten Commandments from inside your churches, and say no longer that you read or believe in the Sermon on the Mount."

We are here to-day to say that we are advocates of the substitution of law and order and reason for force in the settlement of disputes that arise between nations. That method of settling disputes has already been largely adopted in our commercial circles. I have sat as an arbitrator in such cases. But the persons who delight in litigation raise objections and say: "Well, after all the arbitrator does not deal out justice; he frequently divides the amount between the two parties." The same applies with reference to arbitrations, which I am happy to know, which we all rejoice to know, are growing in number with almost every succeeding year.

There are very frequently objections urged to the decision of the arbitrator. The noblest of them all, the precedent for them all, was that grand arbitration which took place between my country and your own in the Alabama case in connection with the war between the North and the South. And yet only last year our Attorney General, Sir Robert Finlay, said to the students of Edinburgh University, of which he had been elected Lord Rector, that in the Alabama arbitration a sum was awarded to the United States so enormous that it was reported that to the present day your government had not been able to find claimants for all of it. [Laughter.]

No less than ten years before I myself had taken the trouble to investigate this statement, which is again and again hurled at us when we are urging arbitration. "Why," they say, "what became of the Alabama arbitration? The United States has pocketed two millions of our money for which they have had no claimants." My letter was in the *Times* of December 29, 1894, and I gave the facts from the official records of your own government, which showed that instead of there not having been sufficient claimants to absorb the award, as a matter of fact the whole sum awarded was claimed and allowed by the court to the actual losers, and an added sum of no less than $3,905,558 had to be paid out of your pockets to meet the deficiency of the award, to satisfy the claims.

It is a hard thing for us who are doing our best to advocate this principle of arbitration to find a man of such eminence as Sir Robert Finlay standing up and making such a statement before such an influential body as the students of Edinburgh University ten years after this letter had appeared in the *Times*, when the figures were there to show how utterly at fault he was.

I believe for myself that even if at times the arbitrator errs, and the award is not always in a strict sense just, in the main it is a better thing to have the dispute settled in a peaceable way rather than to go to war and have to shed blood and lose infinitely more as a consequence of the war than you would by the damages that the arbitrator may choose to give. [Applause.]

War must go. We are reaching a stage in the history of civilization,— and I would fain add, the history of Christianity,— that makes it imperative that war should go. It is the duty of business men for their own interests, and it is the duty of business men for the interests of humanity, to exercise all the great influence within their reach to have arbitration substituted for war.

We read in the poems of Arthur Hugh Clough, the friend of Tennyson, that familiar verse:

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main."

We read in Tennyson's own lines of the world of the future:

"There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

When people talk to us about the objections and difficulties that stand in the way of arbitration, we think of another verse of Clough's, where he says:

"Back flies the foam, the hoisted flag streams back,
The long smoke wavers on the homeward track;
Back fly with winds things which the winds obey,
The strong ship follows its appointed way."

The strong ship of arbitration will go on, and the time will come of which your own poets have sung.

I stood to-day, for the second time, with uncovered head, in Mount Auburn, by the side of the grave of Longfellow; and seldom do I think of him without recalling those beautiful stanzas of his upon "The Arsenal at Springfield." The two last stanzas begin, "Down the dark future." I venture, with reverence, to alter one word. If he were living to-day I think he would alter it himself:

"Down the *bright* future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease;
And like a bell, with solemn, sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, 'Peace!'

"Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals,
The blast of War's great organ shakes the skies;
But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise."

Resolutions Adopted by the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress.

(For convenience given here together and in classified form.)

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR.

1. *Resolved,* That the Congress address to the emperors of Russia and Japan an earnest appeal, entreating them, either by direct negotiations or by having recourse to the friendly offices of some neutral power or powers, to put an end to the awful slaughter of their subjects now going on, and urging the plea that, since terms of peace must sooner or later be discussed and settled, it is far better that this shall be done promptly so as to avert the further sacrifice of precious lives and valuable property.

2. *Resolved,* That the Congress forward an address to each of the powers signatory of the Hague Convention, other than Russia and Japan, reminding them of the provisions of Article 27 of the Convention, and urging them, in accordance therewith, to press upon the governments of Russia and Japan the importance of putting an end without further delay to a war which afflicts humanity, hinders legitimate commerce, and impedes the progress of the world in the pathway of civilization and peace.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

3. The Congress gratefully thanks the President of the United States for his promise to take the first steps toward the convocation of a new International Peace Conference to resume the deliberations commenced at The Hague in 1899. It expresses the opinion that one of the chief duties of such a Conference should be to elaborate and apply a definite plan for the arrest and subsequent simultaneous and proportionate reduction of the military and naval armaments which the Hague Conference declared to be "a crushing burden and constant peril for the whole world."

FRANCO-GERMAN RAPPROCHEMENT.

4. The Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress, having before it the report addressed to it by the International Peace Bureau at Berne, dated July 27, 1904;

Considering that the Twelfth Universal Peace Congress had already charged the Berne Bureau to examine the fundamental grounds on which a rapprochement between France and Germany might be secured, and judging it to be proper more clearly to define and perfect the instructions thus given to the International Bureau;

Instructs the said Bureau to choose from its members a commission which, after having made a careful inquiry into the subject, shall coördinate the results and address to the Fourteenth Universal Peace Congress a detailed report, in which it shall set forth the situation of the two peoples from the point of view of modern international law, and the best methods of bringing about between them a rapprochement in a peaceable and juridic way, that the Fourteenth Congress may be able to take such course in the matter as shall be within its power.

TREATIES OF ARBITRATION.

5. The Congress records its lively satisfaction at the signature of permanent and obligatory arbitration treaties since its last session between: France and Great Britain, France and Italy, Great Britain and Spain, Denmark and the Netherlands, Sweden and Norway and France, Great Britain and Italy, France

and Spain, Spain and Portugal, Great Britain and Germany, Sweden and Norway and Great Britain.

The Congress congratulates the governments of these various countries on having thus taken important further steps in the path of juridic relations between nations, opened by the Hague Convention; and earnestly expresses the hope that the movement now in progress for the extension of the provision of the Hague Convention in the conclusion of new treaties of obligatory arbitration may speedily be adopted by all the signatories of that historic document, and applied without exception to every case of difficulty which cannot be settled by diplomatic means.

The Congress especially rejoices at the statement recently made by the President of the United States that his government is now "taking steps to secure arbitration treaties with all other governments which are willing to enter into them," and trusts that many such treaties will soon be concluded.

The Congress also especially congratulates the governments of Denmark and the Netherlands on having entered into a treaty of arbitration containing no reserves whatever, and commends this as a model for all future treaties.

ARBITRAL CLAUSES IN TREATIES OF COMMERCE.

6. The Congress, noting with satisfaction that the different states are more and more introducing arbitration clauses into their various treaties, and especially into treaties of commerce, urges on the governments that in future this clause should refer to the Hague Court conflicts arising out of the interpretation of these treaties.

A STATED INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

7. This Congress heartily endorses the recommendation made by joint resolution of both Houses of the Massachusetts Legislature in favor of "an international congress to meet at stated periods to deliberate upon questions of common interest to the nations and to make recommendation thereon to the governments"; and notes with great satisfaction that the proposition has been approved by the Interparliamentary Conference recently held at St. Louis, and on the recommendation of that Conference is one of the subjects to be put upon the program of the New International Conference which the President of the United States has declared himself ready to call as soon as practicable.

ARMENIA.

8. *Whereas*, The situation in Armenia seems to be growing worse and the atrocious massacres of the population continue;

Whereas, The reforms planned by the powers for Macedonia have not sufficed to secure the pacification of the country;

Considering the international character of the Eastern Question and the common responsibility of the great powers under the Berlin Treaty for the terrible situation there created,

This Congress appeals to the governments of Europe and the United States immediately to consider the best means of putting an end to the sufferings of alien populations in the Turkish Empire and of restricting or ending the direct rule of the Sultan over such population.

ON PROPAGANDA.

9. *Whereas*, The first need of the peace propaganda is adequate funds to undertake a great campaign of education on the futility and evils of armed peace, the Congress recommends that far more strenuous efforts than have ever been employed shall at once be undertaken, so that the burden of the propaganda shall no longer rest on the weary shoulders of those who have only their leisure time to devote to it.

The Congress further recommends that a sum equal to the price of one first-class battleship — $7,000,000 — shall be solicited from the civilized world to be spent in the practical measures which are embodied in the following suggestions:

The establishment of a centre of propaganda in fourteen or fifteen of the world's great capitals, — Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, Tokio, Cairo, Buenos Ayres, etc. — with $500,000, more or less, to endow each and to give it a conspicuous headquarters. These centres should all be affiliated with existing peace societies and in harmonious relation with the Berne Bureau. They should be officered by men of large experience and ability in organizing, who, according to the need of each locality, should use the following agencies:

a. Books and leaflets in various languages sold at cost price and in attractive form. These should include such historical, economic, religious, sociological and scientific matter as will be useful in reaching all classes of citizens in a peace propaganda.

b. Syndicate articles for the press, especially when friction between nations is impending, and a press bureau which shall supply exact and impartial information as to the real attitude of one nation to another.

c. Illustrated lectures especially for workingmen on questions relating to peace and war.

d. School histories and readers revised and edited so as to minimize the records of military campaigns and emphasize the advance of science, discovery and social progress.

e. The increase of membership in parliamentary arbitration groups by requests from constituents.

f. The enlistment of the intelligent coöperation of those organizations which promote religion and true patriotism, and those which are working to remove artificial barriers on frontiers.

g. Definite, concrete presentation of the economic evils of war by graphic methods which shall appeal to the passer-by, and offers of prizes for the best essays, books, poems, suitable for use in the propaganda.

PEACE FLAG.

10. The Congress approves the recommendation of the Committee on Propaganda that at the present session no action shall be taken regarding a peace flag.

UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE.

11. The Congress decides that the requests which have been presented from different scholarly sources relating, in one case, to a universal alphabet, and in another to a universal language, be referred to the Berne Bureau with power either to act or to recommend action at a later congress.

THE FOURTEENTH CONGRESS.

12. The Congress accepts the kind invitation of the Peace Society at Lucerne, Switzerland, to hold the Fourteenth Congress at Lucerne in 1905, and entrusts the arrangements for the Congress to the Berne Bureau.

PEACE PRAYER.

13. The Congress recommends to the religious authorities of every land that each shall formulate a prayer to be offered in their regular religious services that God will enable the nations of the earth to settle peaceably all their disputes; and that the Berne Bureau be requested to convey this request to the proper authorities.

UNIVERSAL POSTAGE STAMP.

14. In view of the increased demand among all people for reduced postal rates, the Congress recommends to the governments of the earth the adoption of an international two-cent postage stamp.

THE CONGO FREE STATE.

15. *Whereas*, the International Association of the Congo in 1884 secured from the American government that its flag should be recognized as that of a

friendly state (which recognition was subsequently endorsed by the powers of Europe at Berlin) on the ground that it was an organization formed to protect the interests and welfare of the natives, to promote legitimate commerce, and to preserve the neutrality of the Congo Valley over which it sought to exercise authority:

Whereas, it is alleged that the government of the Congo Free State has appropriated the land of the natives and the products of commercial value yielded by the land, thus leading to the committal of grave wrongs upon the native races, and to the infringement of the rights secured for international commerce by the Conference of Berlin:

Whereas, this is a question which may lead to grave international complications:

The Congress, in the interests of peace, recommends that the following questions should be referred either to a new conference of the powers concerned in the formation of the Congo Free State, or to a Commission of Enquiry as provided in the Hague Convention:

1. Is the government of the Congo Free State still to be regarded as the trustee of the powers which recognized the flag of the International Association?
2. If not, what is the position of the Congo Free State in International law, and in what manner may the grave questions concerning its alleged actions be satisfactorily and completely determined?

A PACIFIC ALLIANCE OF STATES.

16. The Congress recalls the terms of Article 27 of the Hague Convention, by which the signatory powers have imposed upon themselves the duty, in case of any serious conflict breaking out, or being about to break out, between two or more of them, of reminding them that the permanent tribunal is open to them, and agrees with the Interparliamentary Conference in expressing "the desire that the powers which signed the Hague Convention should, as far as practicable, agree to act in concert and in the most practical way to fulfill the engagement which Article 27 of the protocol lays upon them."

The Congress recommends as worthy of the consideration of the powers the Model Treaty (see page 196) presented to this Congress as the result of the study of the committees appointed for that purpose by the Peace Bureau in 1900 and the Peace Congress of 1901, having for its object to constitute an arbitral union of states, and to insure that the beneficent initiation of the above Article 27 shall be carried into effect.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WARS.

17. *Whereas*, the wars of the past have had as their profound cause the antagonism of economic interests either of monarchs or of peoples; and

Whereas, since the middle of the nineteenth century wars have assumed more particularly the character of a hasty and brutal appropriation, by the industrially or commercially powerful nations, of the still unexploited markets of the world; and

Whereas, if international conflicts are to be regulated, as they should be, in a friendly way by the better organization of relations among peoples, and if, furthermore, as is still more important, these conflicts are to be prevented by an effort to reconcile human interests, individual as well as collective;

The Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress declares that it is the duty of the friends of peace to study with the greatest care all economic and social movements (trade unionism, coöperation, trusts, etc.) which tend to the realization, unconsciously and sometimes even against the will of their promoters, of a more rational organization of production, consumption and exchange.

And entrusts the Berne Bureau with the duty of collecting as complete information as possible on these questions so far as they are related to the problem of international pacification.

NEUTRALIZATION.

18. The question whether it would not be possible materially to limit the ravages of war by extending to other portions of the world the principle of neutrality already applied to certain territories and navigable waters is referred to the Berne Bureau, which is requested to present a report on the subject to a future congress.

DUTIES OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES.

19. *Resolved*, That the International Peace Bureau at Berne be requested by this Congress to represent to the various patriotic societies in the several countries our sense of the great and peculiar opportunity which is open to them to do a mighty service to their respective nations, as well as for humanity, and to request their powerful and permanent coöperation along such lines as may seem to them best, in the work of educating and interesting the people of those countries in the cause of International Peace and Arbitration.

WEAK NATIONS AND NATIVE RACES.

20. *Resolved*, That while the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress hopes that by the operations of the Hague Court of International Arbitration wars will be averted in the future, the Congress feels strongly that steps should be taken by the civilized governments to safeguard the interests of weak nations and native races, that all who have dealings with them may act strictly on the lines of justice and righteousness.

A FUND FOR PEACE PROPAGANDA.

21. *Resolved*, That an American Committee be appointed by the President of this Congress to act in conjunction with the International Peace Bureau at Berne in raising a fund for peace propaganda and to carry out, so far as they may deem practicable, the recommendations of the Committee on Propaganda adopted by this Congress.

STATISTICS ON THE COST OF WARS.

22. *Resolved*, That the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress convened in Boston, Mass., respectfully recommends the passage by the Congress of the United States of the following resolution :

> *Resolved*, By the Senate and House of Representatives that the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, authorized and instructed to collect and compile from the most authentic and reliable sources statistics on the following subjects, and have the same printed and bound on or before January 1, 1906 :
>
> First: The cost of wars in all countries from the year 1800 down to date, including the expenses of the nation and states, municipalities and otherwise.
>
> Second: The amount paid for pensions and other allowances to soldiers and sailors engaged in such wars.
>
> Third: The amount paid for hospitals and retreats for disabled soldiers and sailors.
>
> Fourth: The amount of property destroyed in such wars by land and sea.
>
> Fifth: The additional cost of maintaining armies and navies in time of peace to each nation during said period.
>
> Sixth: An approximate estimate of the indirect expenses, and damages to the health and property of each nation, resulting from such wars.
>
> Seventh: The number of killed and wounded and disabled on each side during said wars.

Said statistics to be classified under the name of each nation and to be summarized in the most plain and concise manner practicable. On completion said volume to be distributed in the discretion of Congress in this and other countries as preliminary to an International Peace and Disarmament Congress to be held at Washington or The Hague, July 4, 1906, or sooner if practicable.

Resolved, That the Secretary of this Congress be instructed to send certified copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States and to the Secretaries of State and of Commerce and Labor and to the Hon. Richard Bartholdt of St. Louis, President of the Interparliamentary Union, and that Mr. Bartholdt be requested to urge the passage of the above resolution by the Senate and the House of Representatives and their approval by the President of the United States.

Supplementary Public Peace Meetings in Various Cities.

The work of the Peace Congress was supplemented by a series of meetings in various cities, in a number of which the interest in the peace movement rose to quite as great a pitch of earnestness and enthusiasm as in Boston during the week of the Congress. The speakers in these meetings were for the most part delegates from other countries. In New York, Cincinnati and Toronto the meetings resulted in important local organizations, and in all of the places interest in the cause was greatly stimulated. Following is a brief statement of these supplementary meetings:

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8.

Public Meeting in City Hall, attended by about five hundred persons. Dr. Philip S. Moxom presided. Welcome was extended to the delegates by H. H. Bowman, president of the Board of Trade. The speakers were Hon. William P. Byles and Mrs. Byles of Manchester, England; Rev. Alfred L. Lilley, Vicar of St. Mary's, Paddington, London; President Mary E. Woolley of Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; George H. Perris, Secretary of the Cobden Club, London; and Mr. Richard Feldhaus of Basel, Switzerland.

PORTLAND, MAINE, SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8.

On Saturday evening, October 8, a public meeting under the auspices of the Portland branch of the National Council of Women was held in the church of which Rev. J. F. Albion was pastor. The pastor presided. The speakers were Mr. Herbert Burrows, Rev. Richard Westrope, Miss Sheriff Bain of New Zealand, and Mr. Alphonse Jouet of Paris.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8.

New Bedford Woman's Club. Mrs. Ada W. Tillinghast presided. The speakers were Dr. W. Evans Darby, Secretary of the Peace Society, London, and Mrs. Ruth H. Spray of Salida, Colorado, Superintendent of the Arbitration and Peace Department of the Colorado W. C. T. U.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., SUNDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 9.

Public Union Meeting in the First Church, attended by more than one thousand people. President L. Clark Seelye of Smith College presided. The speakers were Mrs. W. P. Byles of Manchester, England; George H. Perris, Secretary of the Cobden Club, London; and the Baroness von Suttner of Vienna.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., MONDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 10.

Public meeting in Memorial Hall under the auspices of the Women's Council, attended by a large audience. Chief Justice John H. Stiness presided. The speakers were Frederic H. Jackson, President of the Chamber of Commerce; J. Frederick Green, Secretary of the International Arbitration and Peace Association of London; Dr. Yamei Kin of China; Rev. Richard Westrope of York, England; and Dr. W. H. P. Faunce of Brown University.

WORCESTER, MASS., MONDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 10.

Meeting of the Congregational Club at Y. M. C. A. Hall. John S. Gould, president of the Club, presided. The speakers were Dr. W. Evans Darby, Secretary of the Peace Society, London; and Benjamin F. Trueblood, Secretary of the American Peace Society, Boston.

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., MONDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 10.

Mass meeting in memory of Elihu Burritt in the South Church, which was crowded to its utmost. Principal Marcus White, chairman of the Burritt Memorial Committee, presided. Many prominent citizens were on the platform. The speakers were George H. Perris, Secretary of the Cobden Club, London; Mr. Richard Feldhaus of Basel, Switzerland; Mrs. W. P. Byles of Manchester, England; Signor E. T. Moneta of Milan, Italy; Herbert Burrows of the Social Democratic Federation, London.

NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 11, 12, 13, and 18.

Tuesday, October 11, 12 o'clock noon, reception and luncheon by the Board of Trade and Transportation. Hon. Oscar S. Straus presided at the reception. The other speakers were Mayor George B. McClellan, President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, Baroness von Suttner, Dr. Gavin Brown Clark, Signor E. T. Moneta, Dr. Yamei Kin, and Professor Theodore Ruyssen,

At 4 o'clock a number of the delegates were entertained at tea by Miss Grace H. Dodge at the Teacher's College, Columbia University.

At 8 o'clock Tuesday evening a reception was given the delegates at the Ethical Culture Building. Professor Felix Adler presided, and the speakers were Herbert Burrows, the Baroness von Suttner, Dr. Yamei Kin, Dr. St. Clair McKelway, Signor E. T. Moneta.

Wednesday morning, October 12, the delegates went on a trip up the Hudson river and lunched at the home of Mrs. Henry Villard, Dobbs' Ferry. A few of them made a visit to the East Side.

Wednesday afternoon a meeting for French inhabitants of New York was held in the Hall of the Mendelssohn Glee Club. The meeting was presided over by Mr. Robert J. Hoguet, president of the *Alliance Française*, and the speakers were Mr. Alphonse Jouet of Paris, Mr. M. J. Prudhommeaux of Nîmes, and Prof. Pierre Clerget of Le Locle, Switzerland.

Wednesday evening a public mass meeting was held in the Hall of the Cooper Union. The audience numbered twelve hundred, completely filling the Hall. Dr. Lyman Abbott presided. The speakers were, besides Dr. Abbott, the Baroness von Suttner, the Bishop of Hereford, George H. Perris, Pete Curran, Dr. Yamei Kin and Prof. Ludwig Quidde.

Thursday afternoon, October 13, at 4 o'clock, in the Hall of the Board of Education, a Young People's meeting was held. More than two thousand children, selected in pairs by the city schools, attended. Vice-President Frank L. Babbott of the Board of Education presided. The speakers were President J. F. Finlay, of New York City College, who welcomed the delegates; the Baroness von Suttner, Miss H. E. Dunhill of India, George H. Perris, Rev. Charles F. Dole of Boston, Rabbi Charles Fleischer of Boston, Mrs. Henry Villard, and Mrs. Donald McLean. An overflow meeting held in the Board room was addressed by Lucia Ames Mead of Boston.

While the New York meetings were in progress, Joseph G. Alexander, Secretary of the International Law Association, London, gave an address to two thousand young women at the Normal School; Miss H. E. Dunhill of India spoke at Adelphi College, Brooklyn; and at the Teachers College, Columbia University, a half hour was given to short addresses by Lucia Ames Mead, George H. Perris, Joseph G. Alexander and Prof. Ludwig Quidde.

Tuesday, October 18, a meeting of the German-Americans of New York City was held at Terrace Garden. The audience, a most enthusiastic one, numbered nine hundred. Dr. Ernst Richard, professor in Columbia University, presided. The speakers were Hon. Oscar S. Straus, the Baroness von Suttner, Prof. Ludwig Quidde, Edward de Neufville and Dr. Joseph Senner. The result of this meeting was the organization later of "The New York German-American Peace Society," as an auxiliary of the American Peace Society, with nearly a hundred members.

PITTSBURG, PA., OCTOBER 13.

Thursday evening, October 13, a public peace meeting was held in the Jewish Temple. Chancellor McCormick presided. The speakers were Dr. W. Evans Darby, Pastor Charles Wagner, Chancellor McCormick of Western University, Hon. John Wanamaker, Professor Koenig of Bordeaux, France, and one or two others.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER 14, 15, 16 AND 17.

Friday morning, October 14. Visit of the Delegates by special train to Swarthmore, Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges. At Swarthmore College a meeting of the students was held in the Lecture Hall. Isaac H. Clothier, Chairman of the Entertainment Committee and a Trustee of the College, presided. The speakers were Dr. G. B. Clark, Hon. Ernest Beckman of the Swedish Parliament, Joseph G. Alexander, the Baroness von Suttner, Miss H. E. Dunhill from India, and Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead of Boston.

At Bryn Mawr College, next visited, after a generous luncheon at the Deanery, a meeting of the students was held in Taylor Hall. Hon. Wayne McVeagh presided. The speakers were Dr. W. Evans Darby, the Baroness von Suttner, Herbert Burrows, Miss H. E. Dunhill, and Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead.

At Haverford College a meeting of the students in Roberts Hall was presided over by the president of the College, Dr. Isaac Sharpless, and addressed by Rev. Richard Westrope, Dr. W. Evans Darby, J. G. Alexander, Rabbi Fleischer, and Signor E. T. Moneta.

Friday at 1 o'clock a meeting for Business Men was held on the floor of the Bourse. The Mayor of Philadelphia, John Weaver, presided. Addresses were made by Dr. G. B. Clark, John Ashworth of Manchester, England, and Frederic H. Jackson, President of the Providence Chamber of Commerce.

Friday afternoon at 4.30 o'clock a reception was given the delegates by the New Century Club. Mrs. C. N. Thorpe, President of the Club, presided, and brief addresses were made by the Baroness von Suttner, Miss H. E. Dunhill, Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead and others.

Friday evening a great public meeting was held in Horticultural Hall, under the auspices of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Dr. L. S. Rowe, President of the Academy, presided. Addresses of welcome were made by the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Mayor of Philadelphia, and a member of the Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. Addresses were made by George H. Perris, Herbert Burrows, Dr. G. B. Clark and Prof. J. C. Bracq of Vassar College.

Saturday morning, the 15th, the delegates spent in visiting Independence Hall and other historic places about Philadelphia.

Saturday evening a large public meeting was held in the spacious Hall of the Drexel Institute. Joshua L. Baily presided. The speakers were Justice David J. Brewer of the United States Supreme Court, Dr. G. B. Clark of England, Signor E. T. Moneta of Milan, Italy, Prof. Ludwig Quidde of Munich, the Baroness von Suttner, Miss H. E. Dunhill, John Ashworth of Manchester, England, and Prof. J. C. Bracq of Vassar College.

Sunday morning, October 16, Prof. J. C. Bracq addressed a meeting in the New Century Drawing Room, under the auspices of the Ethical Society; Miss Sophia Sturge addressed a meeting of two hundred and fifty colored boys and girls at the Joseph Sturge Mission School; Rabbi Fleischer, a meeting at the First Unitarian Church; Dr. W. Evans Darby, a meeting at Swarthmore College; and delegates attended and took part in the Friends' Meetings at Twelfth, Fifteenth and Race Streets, and Germantown.

Sunday afternoon at 4 o'clock a men's meeting of sixteen hundred in the Garrick Theatre, under the auspices of the Y. M. C. A. and presided over by Joshua L. Baily, was addressed by Dr. W. Evans Darby, Rev. Richard Westrope, both of England, and ex-Senator George F. Edmunds of Philadelphia. At the same time also a meeting of a thousand students at the University of Pennsylvania was addressed by Pastor Charles Wagner of Paris.

Sunday evening the largest of the Philadelphia meetings was held in the Baptist Temple (Rev. Russell H. Conwell). Joshua L. Baily presided. The audience numbered three thousand, largely young people, and many were turned away. The speakers were Rev. Richard Westrope, Dr. W. Evans Darby, Rabbi Charles Fleischer, and Miss Helen E. Dunhill. A series of megaphones suspended in front of the platform conveyed the addresses to several hospitals and private dwellings.

On Monday, the 17th of October, a meeting was held at the Philadelphia High School for girls. Wm. W. Birdsall, Superintendent, was in charge. Over one thousand young women were present. Addresses were made by Pastor Charles Wagner of Paris and Prof. Xavier Koenig of the University of Toulouse, France. Hon. John Wanamaker of Philadelphia also took part in the meeting.

The last of the Philadelphia meetings was held under the auspices of the Friends' Institute Lyceum and presided over by Joshua L. Baily. Dr. Darby gave a comprehensive address covering the history of international arbitration.

CANADA MEETINGS, OCTOBER 16, 17, 18, 19 AND 26.

Sunday evening, October 16, a meeting was held in the Unitarian Church, Toronto, under the auspices of the local labor unions. Rev. J. T. Sunderland conducted the meeting. The speakers were Hon. W. P. Byles and Mrs. Byles of Manchester, England, and Prof. J. F. McCurdy of the University of Toronto.

Monday afternoon, October 17, at 4 o'clock, a meeting was held in the hall of the Toronto Conservatory of Music, under the auspices of the National Council of Women. Mrs. Elizabeth Fitzgibbon presided. Addresses were made by Mrs. W. P. Byles and Mrs. Willoughby Cummings.

Monday evening at 8 o'clock, Mrs. Byles addressed the Epworth League rally in the Trinity Methodist Church.

Tuesday evening, October 18, a public meeting was held in the hall of the Normal School. Mr. W. G. Brown, president of the Friends' Association, presided. The speakers were Dr. G. B. Clark and Dr. W. Evans Darby of Great Britain, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood of Boston, and Prof. J. F. McCurdy of Toronto University.

Wednesday forenoon, October 19, Dr. W. Evans Darby and Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood visited the Baptist Convention then in session at Toronto, and were given a half hour in which to address the meeting. At half-past one o'clock the same day Dr. Trueblood addressed a gathering of students and members of the Faculty at the University luncheon, and at four o'clock Dr. Darby addressed the Political Science Club of the University.

At Guelph, sixty miles from Toronto, a meeting was held on the evening of Wednesday at St. Andrew's Church. Rev. Thomas Eakin, pastor of the church, presided. The speakers were Prof. J. F. McCurdy of Toronto, and Dr. W. Evans Darby of London.

At Newmarket on the 26th of October an arbitration meeting was held in the Friends' Church, and addressed by Dr. G. B. Clark, ex-member of the British House of Commons.

The result of the Canadian meetings was a great strengthening of the work in the Dominion, and the creation of a Canadian Arbitration and Peace Society.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, OCTOBER 20.

A public mass meeting was held at 8 o'clock Thursday evening, October 20, in Music Hall. More than thirty coöperating committees had been appointed by the various religious, civic, commercial and other organizations of Cincinnati, including women's societies, and a great audience of more than three thousand persons filled the hall. Judge Rufus B. Smith of Cincinnati presided. The other speakers were President Charles F. Thwing of Western Reserve University, the Baroness von Suttner, Dr. G. B. Clark, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, and Mr. Samuel P. Butler of Cincinnati, to whose faithful and tireless efforts the great success of the meeting was largely due. As a result of the meeting a Cincinnati Arbitration and Peace Society was the next day organized, with about one hundred members.

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 31.

A public peace meeting was held in Sinti Temple, Chicago, on Monday evening, October 31. Addresses were made by Frau Leonore Selenka of Munich, who had failed to reach Boston for the Congress, by Pastor Charles Wagner and Professor Xavier Koenig of France, and by Miss Jane Addams and Dr. Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago.

Alphabetical List of Societies which Appointed Delegates to the Congress.

Those marked with a star (*) either did not attend or did not register.

ALLIANCE DES SAVANTS ET DES PHILANTHROPES, PARIS, FRANCE; ALLIANCE UNIVERSELLE, ST. RAPHAEL, FRANCE.

Theodore Ruyssen.

ALLIANCE UNIVERSELLE DES FEMMES POUR LA PAIX PAR L'EDUCATION, PARIS, FRANCE.

Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey.
*Countess Ludmilla Bobrinsky.
Mrs. Maria Freeman Gray.
Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray.

ALL SOULS CHURCH, ELIZABETH, N. J.

*Mr. Seymour H. Stone.
*Mrs. Seymour H. Stone.

AMALGAMATED COAL TEAMSTERS AND HELPERS, BOSTON, MASS.

P. J. Gallagher.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, BOSTON, MASS.

Dr. Charles G. Ames.
Edward Atkinson.
Joshua L. Baily.
*Hon. William I. Buchanan.
Rev. S. C. Bushnell.
Hon. Samuel B. Capen.
Rev. Charles F. Dole.
*John B. Garrett.
Mrs. Maria Freeman Gray.
Dr. Scott F. Hershey.
Mrs. Julia Ward Howe.
Rev. Charles E. Jefferson.
Burke F. Leavitt.
La Salle A. Maynard.
Edwin D. Mead.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead.
Dr. William A. Mowry.
*Dr. Philip S. Moxom.
Hon. Robert Treat Paine.
George Foster Peabody.
Henry Pickering.
L. H. Pillsbury.
Dr. S. F. Scovel.
*Edwin Burritt Smith.
Dr. Homer B. Sprague.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray.
Rev. G. W. Stearns.
Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Rev. George Batchelor.
Samuel Bowles.
*Rev. James H. Ecob.
Dr. Edward Everett Hale.
Frank N. Hartwell.
*Hon. George F. Hoar.
*Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones.
*President David Starr Jordan.
Prof. Francis G. Peabody.

ARMENIANS OF BOSTON.

V. Krikorian.
G. H. Papazian.

ASSOCIATION COÖPERATIVE DES OUVRIERS DE L'IMPRIMERIE, NIMES, FRANCE.

M. Claude Gignoux.

ASSOCIATION DE LA PAIX DE DENEMARK, COPENHAGEN.

Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood.

Association de la Paix par le Droit, Nimes, France.

*M. Othon Gerlac. M. Alphonse Jouet.
M. Claude Gignoux. M. J. Prudhommeaux.
Prof. Theodore Ruyssen.

Associations Castraise, Montalbanaise, Rouennaise, et Toulousaine de la Paix par le Droit.

Theodore Ruyssen.

Austrian Peace Society, Vienna, Austria.

Countess Pötting Baroness Bertha Von Suttner.

Baptist Ministers' Conference, Detroit, Mich.

* Dr. Spenser B. Meeser.

Baptist Ministers' Conference, Genesee, N. Y.

Rev. Donald D. MacLaurin.

Baptist Ministers' Meeting, Providence, R. I.

Rev. J. T. Beckley, D. D.

Belgian Peace Society, Brussels, Belgium.

M. Auguste Houzeau de Lehaie. M. Henri La Fontaine.
Mme. Henri La Fontaine. *Dr. Paul Otlet.

Bible Christian Church, Manchester, England.

Rev. James Clark. Miss Bertha Clark.

Board of Trade, Jacksonville, Fla.

*Charles H. Smith.

Board of Trade, Massachusetts State.

Charles E. Adams. Edward Atkinson. Hon. Lloyd E. Chamberlain.
Bernard E. Donigan. Hon. Gorham D. Gilman.

Board of Trade, Springfield, Mass.

George H. Sutton.

Bourse de Travail, Nimes, France.

M. Claude Gignoux.

Brighthelmstone Club, Brighton, Mass.

Mrs. W. C. Crawford. Miss Clara R. Keene.

Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Edward W. Peet. Dr. Charles W. Stevens.

Cantabrigia Club, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. F. S. Whitman.

Catholic Church of Boston, Mass.

Rt. Rev. William Byrne, V. G.

Central Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass.

Rev. Albert W. Hitchcock.

Central Labor Union, Boston, Mass.

*Henry Abrahams. *H. Dunderdale. Frank K. Foster.
*Fred J. Kneeland. G. F. Tagen.

Chamber of Commerce, Albany, N. Y.

Hon. William B. Jones.

Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.

Hon. Samuel B. Capen.
Jerome Jones.
Charles M. Cox.
Wallace L. Pierce.
George H. Leonard.

Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.

Hon. E. E. Bradley.
Gen. George H. Ford.
*John Currier Gallagher.
*Gen. E. S. Greeley.
*Hon. Lynde Harrison.
Stuart Hotchkiss.
*Edwin P. Root.
William S. Wells.
*Hon. Rollin S. Woodruff.

Chamber of Commerce, Providence, R. I.

*Charles A. Catlin.
*Arnold B. Chace.
James H. Chace.
Frederick H. Jackson.
*William B. Weeden.
*Edward D. Pearce.
Ex-Gov. Royal C. Taft.

City Missionary Society, Boston, Mass.

Rev. Daniel W. Waldron.

Collegiate Alumnae, Boston Branch, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews.
Miss Eva Channing.
Miss Mary H. Ladd.

Commission of International Justice, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Charles G. Ames.

Composite Club, Uxbridge, Mass.

*James Daley.
*Dr. William L. Johnson.
Rev. Cyrus A. Roys.

Congo Reform Association, London, England.

E. D. Morel.

Congregational Church, High Street, Auburn, Me.

Mrs. John Pratt.

Congregational Church, Pepperell, Mass.

Rev. A. H. Wheelock.

Council of Jewish Women, Boston Section, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. Julius Andrews.

Council of Women, Rhode Island.

Mrs. J. K. Barney.
Mrs. Frederick H. Jackson.

Current Events Club, Hyde Park, Mass.

Mrs. Francis C. Carrington.

Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany.

Richard Feldhaus.
Dr. Hoeltzel.
Professor Hoffmann
Prof. Ludwig Quidde.
Dr. Adolf Richter.
*Frau Margarethe Leonore Selenka.

Deutsche Friedensgesellschaft; Ortsgruppe Cannstadt, Frankfurter Friedensverein, Ortsgruppe Pforzheim, Ortsgruppe Ulm (Donau).

Herr Edward de Neufville.

Dresden Peace Society, Dresden, Germany.

Georg Arnhold.

Dundee Peace Society, Dundee, Scotland.

A. H. Stephen.

"Ebell," Los Angeles, Cal.

Mrs. Philip Gengembre Hubert.

Equal Rights Club, Lynn, Mass.

Mrs. Susanna W. Berry. Dr. Esther Hanks. Mrs. Eliza J. Hitchcock.
Dr. Mabel W. Waldron.

Equal Suffrage League, Sharon, Mass.

George Kempton.

Evangelical Alliance, St. John, N. B.

Rev. George M. Young.

Evangelical Ministers' Association, Manchester, N. H.

*Rev. B. W. Lockhart. *Rev. D. J. Many, Jr.
*Rev. Emil J. Patersoul.

First Congregational Society (Unitarian), Providence, R. I.

Miss Katharine H. Austin.

First Universalist Society, Felchville, Vt.; First Universalist Society, Springfield, Vt.

Rev. Charles Huntington Pennoyer.

First Universalist Society, New Haven, Conn.

Joseph Sheldon.

Franklin Ministerial Union, Franklin, N. H.

Rev. H. C. McDougall.

Friends' Association Peace Department, Toronto, Can.

Rev. Selby Jefferson. *Prof. J. F. McCurdy. Rev. J. T. Sunderland.

Free Religious Association of America.

Rabbi Henry Berkowitz. Mrs. Anna D. Hallowell. *William H. Hamlen.
Carolina Huidobro. Albert S. Parsons.

Gas Workers of Great Britain, General Federation of Trades Unions, General Laborers of Great Britain.

Pete Curran.

Greenacre Conferences, Eliot, Me.

Miss Sarah J. Farmer.

Guild of St. John, Brighton, England.

Mrs. E. M. Southey.

Illinois Yearly Meeting of Friends (Liberal).

Charles W. Mills. *T. P. Marsh.

Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends.

Mary E. Baldwin. Asa T. Baldwin. John L. Thomas. Martha J. Warner.

Indiana Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Miss H. Lavinia Baily.

Institute of Peace Studies, Monaco.

M. L'Abbé Pichot.

International Arbitration and Peace Association, London, England.

Hon. W. P. Byles.
Mrs. W. P. Byles.
Herbert Burrows.
Dr. G. B. Clark.
Mrs. G. B. Clark.
J. Frederick Green.
Mrs. Ashton Jonson.
Rev. A. L. Lilley.
G. H. Perris.
G. Gale Thomas.
Mrs. William Tebb.

International Arbitration Committee of Massachusetts.

Hon. H. E. Cobb.
John C. Cobb.
Edwin Ginn.
Joseph Griswold.
B. F. Keith.
Ashton Lee.
George H. Leonard.
*Hon. John D. Long.
Roger E. Tileston.
Hon. William W. Whiting.

International Arbitration League, London, England.

Herbert Burrows.
Hon. W. P. Byles.
Mrs. W. P. Byles.
*James Caldwell, M. P.
Dr. G. B. Clark.
Mrs. G. B. Clark.
William Randall Cremer, M. P.
Duncan V. Pirie, M. P.
Mrs. Duncan V. Pirie.

International Institute League.

Miss Josephine H. Short.

Interational Law Association.

Joseph G. Alexander.
Dr. W. Evans Darby.

International Peace League.

Mrs. G. B. Clark.

Iowa Yearly Meeting of Friends.

Rev. E. H. Brown.

Italian Labor Union, Boston.

Dominick D'Alessandro.

Italian Peace League.

M. Giuseppe Cerutti, Former Deputy.
M. Alfred Capece Minutolo, Marquis di Bugnano, Deputy.
*M. Gerard Capece Minutolo, Former Deputy.
*The Marquis di San Giuliano, Deputy.

Ladies' P. I., Boston, Mass.

Dr. Gertrude T. Bodfish.
Miss Harriet F. Brazee.

Lancaster Peace and Arbitration Association, England.

Thomas Barrow.
*George H. Weekes.
Miss Sarah E. Barrow

League of Peace (de Lisle), London, England.

Mrs. Maria Freeman Gray.

Lend-a-Hand Society, Boston, Mass.

Rev. C. R. Eliot.
R. B. Tobey.

Ligue Internationale de la Liberte et de la Paix, Luzarches, France.

*Emile Arnaud
*M. Fezandee
*Yves Guyot.
Belva A. Lockwood.
Alfred H. Love.
H. La Fontaine
*E. Tabouriech.
E. T. Moneta.
Adolf Richter.
Theodore Ruyssen.

Liverpool Peace Society, England.

*J. K. Slater.
*Mrs. J. K. Slater.
Hon. Thomas Snape.

Manasquan Civic League, Manasquan, N. J.

Phebe C. Wright.

Manchester Peace Society, Manchester, England.

John Ashworth.
W. A. E. Axon.
*Nathaniel Bradley.
Albert Broadbent.
*Charles Stevenson.
Hon. W. P. Byles.
Mrs. W. P. Byles.

Maryland State Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Albert Sioussat.

Massachusetts Christian Endeavor Union.

Rev. John F. Cowan.
Rev. James J. Dunlop.
Rev. Herbert A. Manchester.
Rev. W. T. McElveen.
Arthur W. Robinson.

Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

*Mrs. M. E. Cheney.
*Mrs. M. E. A. Gleason
*Mrs. I. L. Montgomery.
Mrs. L. C. Purington.
Mrs. Katherine Lente Stevenson.
Mrs. Harriet T. Todd.
Mrs. Harriette D. Walker.
Mrs. Mary D. Ware.

Merchants' Association, Boston, Mass.

Arthur C. Farley.
Thomas B. Fitzpatrick.
Amory A. Lawrence.
Erwin H. Walcott.

Methodist Preachers' Meeting, Boston, Mass.

Rev. L. B. Bates.
Rev. C. W. Blackett.
Rev. E. A. Blake.
Rev. George F. Durgin.
Rev. John Galbraith.
*Bishop Chas. A. Goodsell.
*Bishop Willard F. Mallalieu.
Rev. J. D Pickles.
*Rev. Frederick Woods.

Metropolitan Radical Federation, London, England.

Herbert Burrows.

Ministerial League, Worcester, Mass.

Rev. Arthur L. Weatherly.

Ministers' Association, Providence, R. I.

Rev. John T. Beckley.

Ministers' Association, Worcester, Mass.

*Rev. James C. Duncan.
*Rev. Austin F. Garver.
*Rev. Lewis G. Wilson.

Mohonk Lake Arbitration Conference, New York.

Albert K. Smiley.

Monday Club, Newton Highlands, Mass.

Mrs. Annie I. Eaton.

Moral Education Society, Lynn, Mass.

Mrs. C. W. Geer.

National American Woman Suffrage Association.

Miss Alice Stone Blackwell.
William Lloyd Garrison.
*Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman.
Mrs. Julia Ward Howe.
Miss Anne F. Miller.
Mrs. Elizabeth Smith Miller.
*Miss Anna Howard Shaw.
*Mrs. Mary Bentley Thomas.

National Association for the Promotion of Arbitration, Washington, D. C.

William H. Blymyer.
*William A. Croffut.
*Hon. John W. Hoyt.
Mrs. Belva A. Lockwood.
Robert Stein.

National Christian League for the Promotion of Purity, New York, N. Y.; National Council of Women, Peace Committee.

Elizabeth B. Grannis.

National Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Sarah A. Platt Decker.

National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Peace Department.

Miss H. Lavinia Baily.
Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey.
*Mrs. Ruth H. Burlingame.
Mrs. Sarah W. Collins.
Miss Alice May Douglas.
Miss H. E. Dunhill.
*Mrs. Lydia W. Haviland.
Mrs. Juliet W. Hill.
*Mrs. R. W. Hindsdell.
Mrs. Olive A. Holway.
*Mrs. Mary S. Parry.
*Mrs. J. D. Pretlow.
*Miss Mary H. Read.
*Mrs. Mary Slack.
Mrs. Ruth H. Spray.
Mrs. KatherineLente Stevenson.
*Miss Emily B. Stokes.
Mrs. Harriet T. Todd.

New Century Club, Maplewood, Mass.

Mrs. Nellie M. Greene.

New England Yearly Meeting of Friends.

Timothy B. Hussey.
Augustine Jones.
*Rufus M. Jones.
Miss Mary E. Miars.
Thomas Wood.
Charles Sisson.
Sarah J. Swift.

New Haven Mothers' Club, New Haven, Conn.

*Mrs. E. S. Tillinghast.

Newton Federation of Women's Clubs, Newton, Mass.

Mrs. Alice W. Isola.
Mrs. Nellie Pillsbury.

New York Board of Trade and Transportation, New York, N. Y.

Frank S. Gardner.
*Gen. Edwin A. McAlpin.
William McCarroll.
*Dr. William J. Schiefflin.
*Aaron Vanderbilt.
Hon. Oscar S. Straus.
*Frank Tilford.

New York City Society of Friends (Liberal) Philanthropic Committee.

*E. Eliza Hutchinson.
*John William Hutchinson.
Eliza M. Wilbur.
Henry W. Wilbur.

New York Yearly Meeting of Friends (Liberal), Committee on Philanthropic Labor.

Mrs. Frances E. Baright.
Avis S. Birdsall
J. Edward Borden.
Julia H. Borden.
Hattie W. Graham.
Dr. John H. Shotwell.
Mary B. Shotwell.
Phebe C. Wright.

New York Yearly Meeting of Friends, Evangelistic Committee.

Elmer D. Gildersleeve.

Newtonville Women's Guild, Newtonville, Mass.

Mrs. Frank T. Benner.

Nine Partners Friends' Quarterly Meeting, Dutchess County, N. Y.

Elmer D. Gildersleeve.
Henry H. Swift.
Mary G. Swift.

Norfolk County Temperance Union, Sharon, Mass.

George Kempton.

Norwood Women's Club, Norwood, Mass.

Miss Emily Curtis Fisher.

Old and New Club, Malden, Mass.

Mrs. V. G. Burnham.

Peace Association of Friends in America.

Miss H. Lavinia Baily.
Joshua L. Baily.
Hannah W. Cadbury.
Richard S. Collins.
Mrs. Sarah W. Collins.
Rev. William G. Hubbard.
Mrs. William G. Hubbard.
Augustine Jones.
Miss Helen H. Seabury.
Miss Mary B. Seabury.
Miss Carolena M. Wood.
Thomas Wood.

Peace Society, The, 47 New Broad St., London.

Joseph G. Alexander.
Dr. W. Evans Darby.
Rev. Michael J. Elliott.
*Walter Hazell, M. P.
*Sir John Macdonell.
Mrs. Henry Muff.
Dr. John Percival, Bishop of Hereford.
Mrs. E. M. Southey.
A. H. Stephen.
*Charles Stevenson.
Miss Sophia Sturge.
Rev. Richard Westrope.
Thomas Wright.

Pennsylvania Peace Society.

Dr. S. T. R. Eavenson.
*Mrs. S. R. Griffiths.
Gulielma M. S. P. Jones.
*Thomas J. Whitney.

Philadelphia Friends' Peace Association.

Joshua L. Baily.
Hannah W. Cadbury.
Joseph Elkinton.
Sarah Elkinton.
*John Way.
Richard Wood.

Philadelphia Friends' Yearly Meeting (Liberal) Philanthropic Committee.

Arabella Carter.
Dr. Sarah T. R. Eavenson.
David Ferris.
Abbie M. Hall.
Dr. Edward H. Magill.
Ellwood Roberts.

Poughkeepsie Friends' Church, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Elmer D. Gildersleeve.

Rhode Island Radical Peace Society, Providence, R. I.

Francis Gallagher.

Rhode Island Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mrs. J. K. Barney.

Ruskin Club, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. Clarissa Sears Blackmer.

Salem Century Club, Salem, Mass.

Mrs. Edith D. Symonds.

Second Congregational Church, Dorchester, Mass.

Rev. S. P. Fay.
Rev. Arthur Little, D. D.
Elbridge Torrey.

Second Congregational Society, Northampton, Mass.

Rev. Frederick H. Kent.

Shaker Society, Mt. Lebanon, N. Y.

Catherine Allen.
Sarah Burger.
Daniel Offord.

Social Democratic Federation, London, England.

Herbert Burrows.
Adolphe Smith.

Social Science Club, Newton, Mass.

*Mrs. J. M. Barber.
Mrs. F. A. Pickernell.
Miss E. F. Wilder.

Societe Hongroise de la Paix, Budapest.

Baroness Bertha von Suttner.

Societe des Amis de la Paix du Havre; Societe de l'Education Pacifiste de Croisilles; Societe Marseillaise des Amis de la Paix.

Theodore Ruyssen.

Societe de la Paix du Familistere de Guise.

M. J. Prudhommeaux.

Society of Friends of Great Britain.

Joseph Gundry Alexander.
John Ashworth.
Miss Sarah Elizabeth Barrow.
Thomas Barrow.
Samuel H. Davies.
*Arthur Guy Enock.
Miss Edith M. Rowntree.
*Ernest E. Taylor.
*George Henry Weekes.

Society for the Protection of Italian Immigrants, Boston.

*Eliot Norton.

South Carolina State Teachers' Association.

John J. Dargan.

Spiritualist Association, Lynn, Mass.

George W. Kates.

Swedish Baptist Denomination in America.

Rev. Alfred E. Lindberg.
Rev. C. W. Anderson.

Swedish Peace Society, Stockholm, Sweden.

Hon. John Olsson, Deputy.

Swiss Peace Society.

Prof. Pierre Clerget.

Sydenham Street Methodist Church, Kingston, Ont.

*Rev. W. T. G. Brown.
*E. J. Davis.
*H. B. Taylor.
*C. E. Taylor.

Trades Union Congress, Great Britain.

Pete Curran.

Tunbridge Wells Peace Union, Tunbridge Wells, England.

Joseph G. Alexander.

Tyneside Branch International Arbitration and Peace Association.

*F. S. Ogilvie.

Typographical Union, Boston, Mass.

Henry Sterling.

Unione Lombarda, Milan, Italy; Societa della Pace di Barzano; Societa della Pace di Torre Pellice; Societa della Pace di Torino; Societa della Pace di Voghera.

E. T. Moneta.

Unitarian Church, Medfield, Mass.

Miss Rosa S. Allen.
William F. Guild.

Unitarian Church, Pepperell, Mass.

Mrs. Nathaniel Appleton.
*Miss Ruth Rogers.

Unitarian Church, Syracuse, N. Y.

Rev. A. W. Clark.

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Boston Local Union 33.

*P. R. Kickham.

Chelsea Local Union 218.

*A. H. Bower.

United Hatters of North America.

Jacob Pelser.

Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia, Pa.

*Rev. Matthew Anderson.
Miss Arabella Carter.
Rev. Amando Deyo.
Mrs. Mary Frost Evans.
David Ferris.
*Dr. Robert S. Friedman.
Mrs. Maria Freeman Gray.
Gulielma M. S. P. Jones.
Dr. Agnes Kemp.
*John M. Shrigley.
Rabbi J. Leonard Levy.
Alfred H. Love.
Dr. Edward H. Magill.
Mrs. Edward H. Magill.
Thomas G. Whipple.

Universalist Church, Woodstock, Vt.

Rev. Harry Canfield.

Universalist Convention of Massachusetts.

Rev. Henry Blanchard.
*Rev. E. H. Capen.
*Rev. D. M. Hodge.
Rev. A. J. Patterson.
*Rev. S. H. Roblin.

Universalist Convention of Vermont and Province of Quebec.

Rev. Charles Huntington Pennoyer.

Vermont, State of.

Rev. Harry L. Canfield.
Rev. Charles Huntington Pennoyer.

West Newton Women's Educational Club.

Mrs. M. Theresa Rowe.
Mrs. C. F. Shirley.

West of Scotland Peace and Arbitration Society.

*James Caldwell, M. P.
Rev. Walter Walsh.

Whittier Home Association, Amesbury, Mass.

Mrs. Emily B. Smith.

Wiener Akademischer Friedensverein.

Baroness Bertha Von Suttner.

Woman's Board of Missions, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. J. E. Bradley.
*Mrs. C. L. Goodell.
Mrs. C. L. Lamson.
Miss Kate G. Lamson.
Miss E. Harriet Stanwood.
Mrs. Henry D. Noyes.
*Mrs. Judson Smith.

Woman's Club, Athol, Mass.

Mrs. Millie M. Hinman.

Woman's Club, Brockton, Mass.

Mrs. Hattie E. Shaw.
Mrs. Kathryn S. Tinkham.
Mrs. Martha G. Weston

Woman's Club, Chelsea, Mass.

*Mrs. Carrie F. Bourne.

Woman's Club, Fitchburg, Mass.

Mrs. Alexander Thomson.

Woman's Club, New Bedford, Mass.

Mrs. Jessie K. Cross.
Mrs. Theodore F. Tillinghast.

Woman's Club, Worcester, Mass.

E. A. Kimball.

Woman's Era Club, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. J. H. P. Ruffin.
Mrs. H. C. Smith.

Woman's Home Missionary Association, Boston, Mass.

Mrs. W. H. Blodgett.

Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Boston, Mass., Mrs. E. J. Heard; Pepperell, Mass., Mrs. Nellie B. Appleton; Worcester, Mass., *Mrs. M. D. Kane, *Mrs. A. B. Shaw, Mrs. Mary D. Ware; San Bernardino Co., Cal., Mrs. Sue Smiley Underhill.

Women's Trade Union League of Great Britain.

Herbert Burrows.

World's Unity League of Pepperell, Mass.

Mrs. Nellie B. Appleton.

Alphabetical List of Members of the Thirteenth Universal Peace Congress.

(**Those marked with a star (*) were either not present or did not register.**)

Abbott, Rev. Andrew Jackson	Ashland, Mass.
Abratani, Jiro	Kioto, Japan
Adams, Charles E.	Lowell, Mass.
Addams, Miss Jane	Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
*Adler, Prof. Felix	33 Central Park West, New York City
Akrabova, Miss Evanka S.	9 Crescent Ave., Chelsea (Philippopolis, Bulgaria)
Alexander, Rev. James	Boston, Mass.
Alexander, Joseph Gundry	Tunbridge Wells, England
Alexander, M. W.	9 Portland St., Lynn, Mass.
Alexander, Rev. W. H.	8 Congreve St., Roslindale, Mass.
Alger, Rev. R. F.	36 Northern Ave., Dorchester, Mass.
Allen, Mrs. Caroline B.	West Newton, Mass.
Allen, Catherine	Mt. Lebanon, N. Y.
Allen, Prof. F. J.	206 Holland St., Somerville, Mass.
Allen, Rev. Joseph C.	Walpole, Mass.
Allen, Miss Lucy Ellis	West Newton, Mass.
Allen, Miss Rosa S.	Medfield, Mass.
Ambrose, Mrs. L. W.	20 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Ames, Miss Clara P.	39 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Ames, Rev. Charles G.	12 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Ames, Mrs. Charles G.	12 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Anderson, Rev. C. W.	Worcester, Mass.
Andrew, John C. S.	89 Stratford St., West Roxbury, Mass.
Andrews, Mrs. Fannie Fern	378 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Andrews, Mrs. Julius	Riverbank Court, Cambridge, Mass.
Angell, George T.	19 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Angell, William Randall	Providence, R. I.
Angell, Mrs. William Randall	Providence, R. I.
Appleton, Mrs. Nellie B.	Pepperell, Mass.
Arnhold, Adolph	Gellerstrasse, 1, Dresden, Germany
Arnhold, Georg	Gellerstrasse, 1, Dresden, Germany
Ashad, Aram	Boston, Mass.
*Ashman, Hon. William N.	Orphans Court, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ashmore, William	Wollaston, Mass.
Ashton, Miss Kate	41 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Ashworth, John	8 King St., Manchester, England
Atkinson, Edward	31 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Atwood, L. W.	South Weymouth, Mass.
Austin, Miss Katherine H.	Providence, R. I.
Axon, W. E. A.	Manchester, England
Ayvadian, Sahak	Boston, Mass.
Bailey, Albert A.	Saffordville, Kansas
Bailey, Rev. A. F.	Barre, Mass.
Bailey, Mrs. Hannah J.	Winthrop Centre, Me.
Bailey, Melvin M.	Portland, Me.
Bailey, Mrs. Melvin M.	Portland, Me.
Bailey, Mrs. Phebe W.	Richmond, Ind.
Bailey, Mrs. Rachel A.	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Baily, Miss H. Lavinia	Richmond, Ind.

Baily, Joshua L.	15 Bank St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Bain, Miss Wilhelmina Sheriff	Taranaki, New Zealand
Baker, Loren D.	Wellfleet, Mass.
Baker, Miss Martha A.	Wellfleet, Mass.
Baldwin, Asa T.	Marion, Ind.
Baldwin, Mrs. C. M.	The Gladstone, Roxbury, Mass.
Baldwin, Mary E.	Marion, Ind.
Bangs, Mrs. Elizabeth A.	Eliot, Me.
Bangs, Miss Mary	Dover, N. H.
Bangs, Miss Nellie	Dover, N. H.
Barbour, Rev. Thomas S.	Wollaston, Mass.
Baright, Mrs. Frances	Los Angeles, Cal.
Barker, Mrs. J. Nealey	Newton, Mass.
Barnes, William, Sr.	Albany, N. Y.
Barnes, Mrs. William	Albany, N. Y.
Barney, Mrs. J. K.	529 Broad St., Providence, R. I.
Barrett, Mrs. H. D.	316 Warren St., Roxbury, Mass.
Barrett, Miss Mary D.	4 Gardner St., Allston, Mass.
Barrow, Miss Sarah Elizabeth	Lancaster, England
Barrow, Thomas	Lancaster, England
Barrows, Hon. Samuel J.	135 East 15th St., New York City
Bartlett, Miss E.	Lewiston, Me.
Bates, Rev. L. B.	44 Saratoga St., East Boston, Mass.
Batchelor, Rev. George	Cambridge, Mass.
Batt, William J.	Concord Junction, Mass.
Baulig, Henri	32 Irving St., Cambridge, Mass.
Bayle, Torau	4 rue Dante, Paris, France
Beale, Rev. W. T.	77 Greenwood St., Dorchester, Mass.
Beals, Rev. Charles E.	3 Ellsworth Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Beckley, Rev. John T.	The Hypothenuse, Newport, R. I.
Benneson, Mrs. P.	337 Neponset Ave., Neponset, Mass.
Benner, Mrs. Frank T.	Newtonville, Mass.
Berkowitz, Rabbi Henry	Philadelphia, Pa.
Berry, Susanna W.	105 Franklin St., Lynn, Mass.
Bettle, Edith	Philadelphia, Pa.
Bharati, Baba	207 Huntington Chambers, Boston (Brindaban, India)
Bickford, E. F.	Malden, Mass.
Birdsall, Avis S.	Park Ave. Hotel, New York City
Bishop, Jennie T.	Westminster, Vt.
Blackett, Rev. C. W.	Lynn, Mass.
Blackmer, Mrs. Clarissa S.	42 St. James St., Roxbury, Mass.
Blackmer, Gen. W. W.	Hingham, Mass.
Blackwell, Alice Stone	45 Boutwell Ave., Dorchester, Mass.
Blair, Dr. Arthur W.	Norfolk St., Dorchester, Mass.
Blair, Mrs. H. W.	Manchester, N. H.
Blake, Dr. J. G.	187 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Blake, Rev. Dr.	57 Rutland St., Boston, Mass.
Blakeslee, Rev. Erastus	70 Summit Ave., Brookline, Mass.
Blanchard, Rev. Dr. Henry	Lynn, Mass.
Blanchard, Rev. Joseph N.	Trinity Church, Boston, Mass.
Blodgett, Mrs. Charles	Holyoke, Mass.
Blodgett, Mrs. W. H.	645 Centre St., Newton, Mass.
Blymyer, William H.	49 Wall St., New York City
Blymyer, Mrs. William H.	49 Wall St., New York City
Boardman, Mrs. William D.	199 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Bodfish, Dr. Gertrude T.	153 Mass. Ave., Boston, Mass.
Bond, Charles H.	128 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Bond, Mrs. Charles H.	128 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Bond, H. P.	West Newton, Mass.
Borden, Miss Carolena	383 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Borden, J. E.	Eagletown, N. J.

Borden, Mrs. J. E.	Eagletown, N. J.
Boutelleau, Dr. Gustave	Barbejieux, France
*Boutwell, Hon. George S.	Groton, Mass.
Bowditch, James H.	Brookline, Mass.
Bowles, Rev. Ada C.	Gloucester, Mass.
Bowles, Samuel	Springfield, Mass.
Bowles, Mrs. Samuel	Springfield, Mass.
Boynton, Mrs. C. W.	Melrose, Mass.
Bracq, Prof. Jean C.	Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Bradley, Edward E.	Lincoln, Mass.
Bradley, Miss Lou	Philadelphia, Pa.
Bradley, Mrs. John E.	Randolph, Mass.
Brazee, Miss Harriet F.	131 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
Bridgman, Raymond L.	Auburndale, Mass.
Briggs, Sylvester	19 Fleet St., East Somerville, Mass.
Bright, E. H.	19 Maple Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Broadbent, Albert	Manchester, England
Brockenshire, E.	Milton, Mass.
Broomwell, Rev. C. W.	Buffalo, N. Y.
Brown, Mrs. A. G.	30 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Brown, Mrs. C. A.	13 Shaw St., West Newton, Mass.
Brown, Rev. Charles Rufus	Newton Centre, Mass.
Brown, Rev. E. Howard	Earlham, Iowa
Brown, Miss Lucy H.	17 Rockland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Brown, Mary E.	1707 Centre St., West Roxbury, Mass.
Brown, R. G.	18 Matthews Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
Browne, Grace	Cleveland, Ohio
Brunet, Mrs. Frank T.	35 Trowbridge Ave., Newtonville, Mass.
*Buchanan, Hon. Wm. I.	410 Elmwood Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
Buck, Miss Alice	114 Prospect St., Fall River, Mass.
Buffum, Samuel	North Berwick, Me.
Buffum, Mrs. Samuel	North Berwick, Me.
Burditt, C. A.	1848 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Burger, Sarah	Mt. Lebanon, N. Y.
Burgess, Mrs. Emilie U.	Highland, N. Y.
Burlin, Dr. F.	535 Beacon St., Boston
Burnham, W. R.	Norwich, Conn.
Burnham, Mrs. V. G.	30 Francis St., Malden, Mass.
Burr, Rev. Everett D.	Newton Centre, Mass.
Burrows, Herbert	99 Sotheby Road, Highberry Park, London, N., England
Bushnell, Rev. S. C.	Arlington, Mass.
Buttrick, Miss Mary E.	Sterling, Mass.
Byles, W. P.	3 Northumberland St., Broughton, England
Byles, Mrs. W. P	3 Northumberland St., Broughton, England
Byrne, Rt. Rev. William, V. G.	St. Cecilia's Church, Boston, Mass.

Cadbury, Miss H. W.	Locust Ave., Germantown, Pa.
Callis, Rev. Henry J.	2 Claremont St., Boston, Mass.
Campbell, J. M.	106 Berkshire St., Cambridge, Mass.
Canfield, Rev. Henry S.	Woodstock, Vt.
Capen, Edward W.	38 Greenough Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Capen, Miss Mary	38 Greenough Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Capen, Hon. Samuel B.	38 Greenough Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Capen, Mrs. Samuel B.	38 Greenough Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
*Carnegie, Andrew	New York City
Carrington, Mrs. Frances C.	Hyde Park, Mass.
Carrington, Gen. H. B.	Hyde Park, Mass.
Carter, Miss Alice M.	Rawson Road, Brookline, Mass.
Carter, Arabella	Byberry, Philadelphia, Pa.
Carter, C. F.	Lexington, Mass.

Cerutti, Signor Giuseppe	Venice, Italy
Chace, James H.	Keene St., Providence, R. I.
Chace, Mrs. James H.	Keene St., Providence, R. I.
*Chamberlain, Leander T.	"The Chelsea," West 23d St., New York City
Chamberlain, Lloyd E.	Brockton, Mass.
Chandler, Edward H.	2 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass.
Channing, Miss Eva	Boston, Mass.
Chapin, Miss M. H.	84 Upland Ave., Brookline, Mass.
Chase, Dr. H. Lincoln	172 Aspinwall Ave., Brookline, Mass.
Chase, Miss Lucy	11 Chancery Court, Lynn, Mass.
Chase, Miss Sarah Earle	11 Chancery Court, Lynn, Mass.
Chirurg, Dr. M.	212 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass.
Churchill, Mrs. Frederick H.	New Britain, Conn.
Churchill, Miss L. A.	23 West 12th St., New York City
Churchill, Miss Rose	New Britain, Conn.
Clark, Ana F.	115 Gale St., Roxbury, Mass.
Clark, Rev. A. W.	Unitarian Church, Syracuse, N. Y.
Clark, Miss Bertha	Salford, Manchester, England
Clark, Rev. Francis E.	Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.
Clark, Dr. G. B.	Fryene, Catsham, Surrey, England
Clark, Mrs. G. B.	Fryene, Catsham, Surrey, England
Clark, Rev. James	Salford, Manchester, England
*Clark, Prof. John B.	Columbia University, New York City
Clement, Edward H.	"Boston Transcript," Boston, Mass.
Clement, Mrs. Winnie Bailey	Haddonfield, N. J.
Clerget, Prof. Pierre	Le Locle, Switzerland
Cobb, Miss Alice G.	Brookline, Mass.
Cobb, Hon. H. E.	Newton, Mass.
Cobb, John C.	60 State St., Boston, Mass.
Coffin, Fletcher B.	Newton, Mass.
Coffin, Sarah Taber	Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Coffin, William H.	Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Coit, Rev. Joshua	Winchester, Mass.
Collins, Miss Hannah	Purchase, N. Y.
Collins, Richard S.	Purchase, N. Y.
Collins, Sarah W.	Purchase, N. Y.
Comey, Mrs. Arthur M.	54 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Compans, Marquis Carlo	Turin, Italy
Conant, Charles H.	53 Central St., Lowell, Mass.
Conley, Supt. George H.	Mason St., Boston, Mass.
Cooke, George Willis	1 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Coombs, Hon. William J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cornell, Mrs. Idaer Tucker	Salem, Mass.
Cornish, L. C.	Hingham, Mass.
Cosey, Mrs. George	142 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cowan, Rev. John F., D. D.	Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.
Cowperthwaite, Miss C.	Yonkers, N. Y.
Cox, Charles M.	713 Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.
Cramer, Mrs. Mary Grant	East Orange, N. J.
Crathern, Rev. C. F. H.	South Braintree, Mass.
Crawford, Mrs. William C	80 Ashford St., Allston, Mass.
Cremer, William Randal, M. P.	London, England
Cross, Mrs. Jessie K.	390 Union St., New Bedford, Mass.
Culbertson, Dr. Emma	33 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Cummings, Rev. Edward	104 Irving St., Cambridge, Mass.
Cummings, Mrs. E. E.	Portland, Me.
Cunningham, Frederick	Brookline, Mass.
Cunningham, Dr. Thomas E.	847 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Curran, Pete	1 Pretoria Ave., Walthamstow, Essex, England
Cushing, Miss C. L.	Hotel Kempton, Boston, Mass.
Cutter, Dr. George W.	Arlington, Mass.

Dale, Mrs. Edwin	1651 Beacon St., Brookline, Mass.
D'Alessandro, Dominick	18 North Square, Boston, Mass.
Dame, Mary	Lynn, Mass.
Daniell, Mrs. H. W.	271 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Daniell, Miss Maria E.	271 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Daniels, L.	288 Hotel Bellevue, Boston, Mass.
Darby, Dr. W. Evans	47 New Broad St., London, England
Dargan, John J.	Hartsville, South Carolina
David, Rev. Joseph S.	Elmwood, Mass.
David, Mrs. Joseph S.	Elmwood, Mass.
Davidson, C. W.	41 Summer St., Boston, Mass.
Davies, Samuel H.	York, England
Davis, Adeline	67 Fourth St., New Bedford, Mass.
Davis, Hayne	69 Wall St., New York City
Davis, Rev. M. V. W.	Pittsfield, Mass.
Dawson, Mrs. E. E.	Winthrop, Mass.
Decker, Mrs. Sarah A.	Denver, Col.
De Veuve, Mrs. Prentiss	Dayton, Ohio
Deyo, Rev. Amanda	Highland, N. Y.
Dight, Rev. Alexander	Natick, Mass.
Dike, Rev. Samuel W.	Auburndale, Mass.
*Dodge, Cleveland H.	99 John St., New York City.
*Dodge, Miss Grace H.	90 Park Ave., New York City.
Dole, Rev. Charles F.	Roanoke Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Dole, Mrs. Charles F.	Roanoke Ave., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Donigan, Bernard E	Lawrence, Mass.
Donnaruma, J. V.	27 Sheafe St., Boston, Mass.
Douglas, Miss Alice May	Bath, Me.
Dresser, H. W.	73 Wendell St., Cambridge, Mass.
Dudgeon, Mrs. Maud	63 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Dudley, Miss H. S.	93 Tyler St., Boston, Mass.
Dudley, Mrs. John Langdon	Hotel Aberdeen, St. Paul, Minn.
Dunhill, Miss Helen E.	112 Irvine Ave., Westmount, Quebec, Can.
Dunlop, Rev. James J.	43 Georgia St., Roxbury, Mass.
Durgin, Rev. George F.	Roslindale, Mass.
Dyer, Miss S. L.	East Weymouth, Mass.

Eames, Mrs.	Blackston, Mass.
Earle, Mrs. James H.	127 Galen St., Newton, Mass.
Eaton, Mrs. Annie I.	340 Lake Ave., Newton Highlands, Mass.
Eaton, Mrs. C. E.	Orange, N. J.
Eavenson, Ida C.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Eavenson, Sarah T. R.	2013 Vine St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Eckstein, Miss Anna B.	30 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Eddy, Miss Sarah J.	Bristol Ferry, R. I.
Edmands, Herbert H. W.	60 Forest St., Roxbury, Mass.
*Edmunds, Hon. George F.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Eggleston, Rev. N. H	391 South St., Forest Hills, Mass.
Eliot, Rev. C. R.	2 West Cedar St., Boston, Mass.
Eliot, Pres. Charles W.	Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Eliot, Rev. S. A.	25 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Eliott, Benjamin Franklin	72 Waltham St., Boston, Mass.
Eliott, Mrs. B. F.	72 Waltham St., Boston, Mass.
Elliott, Rev. Michael James	Wesley Manse, Watlington, Oxon., England
Elkinton, Joseph	Medea, Pa.
Elkinton, Sarah W.	Medea, Pa.
Elmell, Mrs. W. Huntington	36 Munroe Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Ensign, Mrs. D. W.	6 Bigelow St., Cambridge, Mass.
Evans, Herbert S.	1651 Beacon St., Brookline, Mass.

Farley, Arthur C.	Auburndale, Mass.
Farmer, Miss Sarah J.	Greenacre, Eliot, Me.
Farquhar, A. B.	York, Pa.
Farwell, Mrs. Catherine E.	Lancaster, Mass.
Farwell, P. T.	Wellesley, Hills, Mass.
Faunce, C. M.	3 Circuit St., Roxbury, Mass.
Fay, Rev. S. P.	Dorchester, Mass.
Feldhaus, Richard	Bottmingermühle, (near) Basel, Switzerland
Fenno, J. P.	East Milton, Mass.
Ferris, David	301 West St., Wilmington, Del.
Filley, Miss	76 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Filley, Mrs. O. B.	76 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Findlay, Alexander, M. P.	Mother Wells, Glasgow, Scotland
Fisher, Adelaide C.	160 West Concord St., Boston, Mass.
Fisher, Miss A. E.	5 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
Fisher, Miss Emily C.	Norwood, Mass.
Fiske, George R.	116 Broad St., Boston, Mass.
Fitz, Mrs. H. G.	75 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas B.	Brookline, Mass.
Fleischer, Rabbi Charles	Cambridge, Mass.
Flint, Mrs. D. B.	Hotel Somerset, Boston, Mass.
Fogler, Miss Grace	29 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Folsom, Ellen M.	4 Riedesel Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Ford, Gen. George Hare	Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.
Foster, Miss Elizabeth	44 Fairfield St., Boston, Mass.
Foster, Frank K.	116 Eliot St., Boston, Mass.
*Foster, Hon. John W.	18th St., Washington, D. C.
Fraser, Mrs. Matilda A.	Garrison Hall, Garrison St., Boston, Mass.
Frenyear, Myra G.	Suite 2, 17 Durham St., Boston, Mass.
Frothingham, Miss J. W.	37 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Frothingham, Rev. Paul Revere	294 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Frothingham, Mrs. Paul Revere	294 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Fuller, Miss Eliza W.	3 Milton Road, Brookline, Mass.
Galbraith, Rev. John	Wenonah St., Roxbury, Mass.
Gallagher, Francis	Providence, R. I.
Gallagher, P. J.	2 Gray St., Charlestown, Mass.
Garcelon, Miss O. D.	12 Waumbeck St., Roxbury, Mass.
Gardner, Frank S.	Board of Trade and Transportation, New York
Gardner, Rev. Walter	East Walpole, Mass.
Gargan, Thomas J.	14 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass.
Gargan, Mrs. Thomas J.	14 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass.
Garkin, Rev. G. E.	West Derry, N. H.
Garlin, Lucy Hale	84 Prospect St., Providence, R. I.
*Garrett, Philip C.	Logan, Philadelphia, Pa.
Garrison, Francis J.	Lexington, Mass.
Garrison, Mrs. Francis J.	Lexington, Mass.
Garrison, William Lloyd	Lexington, Mass.
Geer, Mrs. C. W.	27 Breed St., Lynn. Mass.
George, Mrs. A. J.	Brookline, Mass.
*Gibbons, Cardinal	Baltimore, Md.
Gibson, Mrs. Ruth	212 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Gifford, Elizabeth	New Bedford, Mass.
Gignoux, Claude M.	Nîmes, France
Gilbert, Hon. John I.	Malone, N. Y.
Gildersleeve, Elmer D.	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Gilman, Bradley	Hemenway Chambers, Boston, Mass.
*Gilman, Daniel C.	Carnegie Institute, Washington, D. C.
Gilman, Gorham B.	Newton, Mass.
Ginn, Edwin	29 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

Gobat, Mlle. Marguerite	Berne, Switzerland
Goldsmith, Mrs. Mary A.	Lynn, Mass.
Goldsmith, Mrs. Minnie	137 Cedar St., Roxbury, Mass.
Gompers, Samuel	423 G St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Goodwin, Mary Ripley	The Westminster, Boston, Mass.
Gordon, Dr. John S.	Ogden, Utah
Gordon, Miss Mary	5 Grove St., Exeter, N. H.
Gow, Rev. John R.	Somerville, Mass.
Graham, Hattie Wright	Flushing, N. Y.
Graham, Miss Marion	Brookline, Mass.
Granger, Mrs. Alice M.	Randolph, Mass.
Grannis, Mrs. Elizabeth B.	5 East 12th St., New York City
*Gray, Hon. George	Wilmington, Del.
Gray, Maria Freeman	3674 22d St., San Francisco, Cal.
Green, J. Frederick	40 Outer Temple, Strand, London, W. C., Eng.
Greene, Miss Elizabeth Harrington	424 Mass. Ave., Boston, Mass.
Greene, Mrs. Nellie M.	76 Fairview Ave., Malden, Mass.
Greenman, Rev. W. F.	Watertown, Mass.
Grew, Henry S.	89 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Grew, Mrs. Henry S.	89 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Griswold, Joseph	Greenfield, Mass.
Grover, Rev. R. B.	Hope Church, Cambridge, Mass.
Guild, William F.	Medfield, Mass.
Gunton, Mrs. George	128 West 43d St., New York City

Hale, Rev. Edward E.	39 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Hall, Abbie M.	Swarthmore, Pa.
Hallowell, Miss Emily	Brush Hill, Hyde Park, Mass.
Hallowell, Mrs. N. P.	West Medford, Mass.
Hallowell, Mrs. Robert H.	West Medford, Mass.
Hamilton, Rev. B. F.	34 Linwood St., Roxbury, Mass.
Hamilton, Mrs. B. F.	34 Linwood St., Roxbury, Mass.
Hanks, Dr. Esther	Lynn, Mass.
Harkness, Prof. Albert	Providence, R. I.
Harkness, Mrs. Albert	Providence, R. I.
Harrington, Rev. C. E.	Waltham, Mass.
Harris, Mrs. A. E.	Putnam Heights, Conn.
Harris, Simon	Hull, England
Harris, Mrs. Simon	Hull, England
Harrison, William	Manchester, England
Hart, Edwin A.	Billerica, Mass.
Hartwell, Frank N.	Louisville, Ky.
Haskell, Miss Ellen M.	50 Barnes St., Providence, R. I.
Haskins, David Greene, Jr.	5 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
Hastings, Mrs. Mary L.	95 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass.
Hathaway, Miss C. Louise	Santa Rosa, Cal.
Hathaway, Mrs. Ella B.	St. John, N. B.
Hay, Hon. John	Washington, D. C.
Hazard, Mr. M. C.	Congregational House, Boston, Mass.
Head, George Herbert	Cambridge University, Cambridge, England
Heard, Mrs. E. J.	14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Heath, D. C.	Newtonville, Mass.
Hedge, Miss Charlotte A.	Brookline, Mass.
Heffron, Ida C.	1911 West 103d St., Chicago, Ill.
Heilborn, J.	503 Washington St., Brookline, Mass.
Heinzen, K. F.	45 Centre St., Roxbury, Mass.
Heinzen, Mrs. K. F.	45 Centre St., Roxbury, Mass.
Hemphill, Ashton E.	Holyoke, Mass.
Henry, Eva A.	17 St. James Ave., Boston, Mass.

Hershey, Rev. Scott F.	Columbus Ave. Presbyterian Church, Boston, Mass.
Higgins, Mrs. David	230 Fairmount Ave., Hyde Park, Mass.
*Higginson, Col. Thomas Wentworth	Cambridge, Mass.
Hill, Juliet W.	Carthage, Mo.
Hill, Mrs. William W.	21 Merrimac St., Concord, N. H.
Hilton, Mrs. Mary	1073 South Main St., Brockton, Mass.
Hinkley, Mrs. S. B.	Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Hinman, Mrs. Nellie M.	72 Green St., Athol, Mass.
Hinton, Miss S. McV.	New York City
Hitchcock, Rev. A. W.	Institute Road, Worcester, Mass.
Hitchcock, Eliza J.	813 Western Ave., Lynn, Mass.
Hodder, Mrs.	Shaker Station, Conn.
Hodges, Benjamin D.	Topsfield, Mass.
Hodges, Mary Osgood	Topsfield, Mass.
Hoffman, Professor	Stuttgart, Germany
Hogan, Robert J.	Schenectady, N. Y.
Holmes, Edward J.	296 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Holmes, Mrs. Edward J.	296 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Holls, Mrs. F. W.	583 North Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y.
Holway, Mrs. Olive A.	Augusta, Me.
Homas, Miss Amy Morris	26 Berwick Park, Boston, Mass.
Homer, Rev. T. J.	Melrose, Mass.
Hooper, Mrs. S. T.	65 Spark St., Cambridge, Mass.
Hosmer, George	Whitman, Mass.
Horne, Sarah L.	2 Appleton St., Cambridge, Mass.
Hotchkiss, H. Stewart	Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.
Houzeau de Lehaie, M. A.	Mons, Belgium
Howe, Julia Ward	241 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Howland, Emily	Sherwood, N. Y.
*Howells, William Dean	44 West 59th St., New York City
Hubbard, Samuel F.	North End Union, 20 Parmenter St., Boston, Mass.
Hubbard, William G.	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Hubbard, Mrs. William G.	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Hubert, Mrs. Philip Gengembre	2144 Hobart Building, Los Angeles, Cal.
Huidobro, Carolina	7 Durham St., Boston, Mass.
Huling, Ray Greene	101 Trowbridge St., Cambridge, Mass.
Humphreys, C. B.	272 Congress St., Boston, Mass.
Hunt, Mrs. Sumner P.	Severance St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Huntington, Rev. Henry S.	Congregational Church, Milton, Mass.
Hurtubis, Francis J.	State House, Boston, Mass.
Hussey, Timothy B.	North Berwick, Me.
Hussey, William T.	223 State St., Boston, Mass.
Huxtable, Rev. James	568 Fifth St., South Boston, Mass.

Ide, Rev. H. C.	New Britain, Conn.
Irvine, Rev. Alexander F.	People's Church, New Haven, Conn.
Isola, Mrs. Alice W.	Waban, Mass.
Italian Immigrants Society	17 Pearl St., New York City

Jackson, Mrs. A. J.	Dakota St., Dorchester, Mass.
Jackson, Frederick H.	Chamber of Commerce, Providence, R. I.
Jackson, Mrs. Frederick H.	Providence, R. I.
James, Pres. Edmund J.	Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
Jefferson, Rev. Charles E.	Broadway Tabernacle, New York City
Jefferson, Rev. Selby	Louisburg, Cape Breton
Jenks, Miss Anna B.	553 Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass.
Jergitsch, Reinhold	Klagenfurt, Austria
Johnson, Miss Elizabeth	32 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Johnson, Miss Harriet E.	32 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.

Johnson, Rev. Tilman B.	74 Welles Ave., Dorchester, Mass.
Jones, Augustine	111 Lincoln St., Newton Highlands, Mass.
Jones, Mr. E. W.	Lynn, Mass.
Jones, Gulielma M. S. P.	634 Race St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Jones, Henry	Camden, Me.
*Jones, Rev. Jenkin Lloyd	3939 Langley Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Jones, Jerome	51 Federal St., Boston, Mass.
Jones, Lindsey S.	61 Bainbridge St., Roxbury, Mass.
Jones, Hon. W. Martin	Rochester, N. Y.
Jones, W. Carlton	119 Highland Ave., Salem, Mass.
Jones, Hon. William B.	Albany, N. Y.
Jonson, Ashton	London, England
Jonson, Mrs. Ashton	London, England
*Jordan, David Starr	Leland Stanford University, Stanford University, Cal.
Jordan, Miss Helen	172 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Jose, Mrs. Mellen	13 Eden St., Charlestown, Mass.
Jouet, M. Alphonse	58 Quai des Grands Augustins, Paris, France

Kane, William	Lakeville, Conn.
Kane, Mrs. William	Lakeville, Conn.
Kates, G. W.	Thornton, Pa.
Keene, Miss C. R.	41 Murdock St., Brighton, Mass.
Keith, B. F.	Boston, Mass.
Kemp, Agnes, M. D.	Swarthmore, Pa.
Kempton, George	Sharon, Mass.
Kendall, Herbert E.	Nashua, N. H.
Kendrick, Mrs. H. B.	Parker House, Boston, Mass.
Kent, Rev. Frederick H.	Northampton, Mass.
Kidner, Rev. Reuben	16 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass.
Kilham, Miss Annie M.	8 Thorndike St., Beverly, Mass.
Kimball, E. A.	Worcester, Mass.
Kimball, Miss H. F.	292 Kent St., Brookline, Mass.
Kimball, H. H.	292 Kent St., Brookline, Mass.
Kimball, L. S.	292 Kent St., Brookline, Mass.
Knickerbocker, C. A.	Arlington, Mass.
Knickerbocker, Mrs. C. A.	Arlington, Mass.
Kin, Dr. Yamei	Care of Mrs. Ole Bull, Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass.
Kirsch, Nathalie	Eliot, Me.
König, Prof. Xavier	Tonneins, près de Toulouse, France
Krikorian, V.	Box 1401, Boston, Mass.

La Fontaine, M. Henri	Rue d' Arlon, 81, Brussels, Belgium
La Fontaine, Madame	Rue d' Arlon, 81, Brussels, Belgium
Lamb, Miss M. H.	111 Perkins St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Lamson, Mrs. C. M.	Congregational House, Boston, Mass.
Lamson, Miss K. G.	Congregational House, Boston, Mass.
Lange, Mrs. E. M.	41 Georgia St., Roxbury, Mass.
Larajian, Horsep	
Latimer, Rev. G. D.	Salem, Mass.
Lawrence, Amory A.	59 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Lawrence, R. B.	Medford, Mass.
Lawrence, Bishop William	1 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
Leavitt, Rev. B. F.	Melrose Highlands, Mass.
Lee, Ashton	Lawrence, Mass.
Lee, Mrs. Sarah White	33 Harvard Ave., Brookline, Mass.
Lefavour, Pres. Henry	Simmons College, Boston, Mass.
Leland, Mrs. Emma B.	Concord Junction, Mass.
Leland, Mrs. J. F.	Sherborn, Mass.
Lenox, John E.	Hotel Vendome, Boston, Mass.

Leonard, George H.	Hotel Brunswick, Boston, Mass.
LeRoyer, Jenny	Auburndale, Mass.
Lesser, Mrs. Alice Parker	42 Court St., Boston, Mass.
Levy, Mrs. E. J.	159 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Levy, Rabbi J. Leonard	Pittsburg, Pa.
Lilley, Rev. A. L.	St. Mary's Vicarage, Paddington, London, England
Lincoln, Dr. David F.	84 Myrtle St., Boston, Mass.
Lincoln, William H.	Brookline, Mass.
Lindberg, Rev. Alfred E.	Swedish Baptist Temple, Boston, Mass.
Linderstrom, Mr. C. R.	Swampscott, Mass.
Little, Rev. Arthur	Dorchester, Mass.
Livermore, Mrs. Mary E.	Melrose, Mass.
Locke, Anstice	52 Friend St., Lynn, Mass.
Lockwood, Belva A.	619 F St., Washington, D. C.
*Logan, Walter S.	27 Williams St., New York City
*Long, Hon. John D.	Hingham, Mass.
Loomis, Miriam M.	Auburndale, Mass.
Lord, Mrs. J. E.	North Berwick, Me.
Loring, Miss Katherine P.	Prides Crossing, Mass.
Loring, Miss Louisa P.	Prides Crossing, Mass.
Lough, Thomas, M. P.	14 Westminster Ave., London, England.
Love, Alfred H.	1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Lovell, Mrs. Mary F.	Wincote, Pa.
*Lowell, Mrs. Charles R.	120 East 130th St., New York City
Lund, Hon. John	Bergen, Norway
Lund, Miss Ragenhild	Bergen, Norway
Lusk, Rev. J. F.	124 Chandler St., Boston, Mass.
Lyman, Miss Marian	18 Lansdowne St., Boston, Mass.
Lyon, Edwin B., M. D.	New Britain, Conn.

MacAllister, Miss	Philadelphia, Pa.
MacDonald, Rev. F. A.	Lexington, Mass.
*MacVeagh, Hon. Wayne	Washington, D. C.
Magill, Edward W.	128 West 43d St., New York City
Magill, Sarah E. G.	128 West 43d St., New York City
Manchester, Rev. Herbert	59 Monmouth St., East Boston, Mass.
Manchester, Mrs. J. C.	Providence, R. I.
Manning, Mrs. A. D. F.	215 Salem St., Medford, Mass.
Manning, Jerome F.	Lowell, Mass.
Mansfield, Rev. J. H.	41 Osborne Road, Brookline, Mass.
Marble, Rev. F. R.	15 Forest St., Cambridge, Mass.
Mard, George A.	Swarthmore, Pa.
Mariotti, Mrs. Eva	3 Via Monte della Farina, Rome, Italy
Marr, Rev. George A.	Box 67, Swarthmore, Pa.
Marrs, Mrs. Kingsmall	Saxonville, Mass.
Marston, Mrs. Mary Gage	13 Gage St., Methuen, Mass.
Martin, George H.	388 Summer St., West Lynn, Mass.
Martin, John	Hurricane, N. Y.
Martin, Robert M.	Salem, Mass.
Martin, Mrs. Robert M.	Salem, Mass.
Mason, Miss Ellen F.	R. I. Ave., Newport, R. I.
Mason, Miss Ida	R. I. Ave., Newport, R. I.
Mason, Jean B.	Topsfield, Mass.
Masseck, Rev. Frank L.	Spencer, Mass.
Mather, Loren	Manchester, Eng.
Mather, Miss	Manchester, Eng.
May, Edith Rogers	146 Tappan St., Brookline, Mass.
Maynard, L. A.	Bible House, New York City
McArthur, Rev. Robert S.	358 W. 57th St., New York City

McCall, Hon. Samuel W.	Winchester, Mass.
McCall, Mrs. Samuel W.	Winchester, Mass.
McCarroll, William	American Leather Co., Jacob and Ferry Sts., New York City
McDonald, Rev. L. B.	Concord, Mass.
McDonald, Mrs. Sarah	400 Northampton St., Boston, Mass.
McDougall, Rev. H. C.	Franklin, N. H.
McDowell, Miss Mary E.	4638 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.
McElveen, Rev. W. T.	178 West Brookline St., Boston, Mass.
McGrath, J.	502 Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass.
McGray, Mrs. H. D.	West Somerville, Mass.
McLaurin, Rev. Donald D.	Rochester, N. Y.
McNeill, George E.	161 Devonshire St., Boston, Mass.
Mead, C. N.	21 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Mead, Caroline Thayer	21 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Mead, Edwin D.	20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Mead, Mrs. John	450 Centre St., Newton, Mass.
Mead, Lucia Ames	39 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Meader, John H.	106 Maple St., Roxbury, Mass.
Meader, Olney T.	106 Maple St., Roxbury, Mass.
Meader, Mrs. Susan H.	106 Maple St., Roxbury, Mass.
Means, Rev. F. H.	Winchester, Mass.
Melikoff, Dr. Jean Loris	3 avenue de l'Observatoire, Paris, France
Melish, Rev. J. H.	Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.
*Mercer, George G	Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Merriam, Rev. C. E.	West Derry, N. H.
Miars, Miss Mary E.	12 Mason St., Lynn, Mass.
Miller, Dr. A. E.	110 Tremont St., Needham, Mass.
Miller, Anne F.	Geneva, N. Y.
Miller, Elizabeth Smith	Geneva, N. Y.
Miller, Isabel	Sandy Spring, Md.
Miller, Rev. Morgan	83 Institution Ave., Newton Centre, Mass.
Miller, Mrs. Morgan	83 Institution Ave., Newton Centre, Mass.
Mills, Charles W.	20 Exeter St., Belmont, Mass.
Mills, Harriet May	Syracuse, N. Y.
Mills, Mrs. James E.	Newtonville, Mass.
Minutolo, Alfred Capece, Marquis di Bugnano	Naples, Italy
Mitchell, John	Wilkesbarre, Pa.
Mitchell, Max	51 Mountfort St., Boston, Mass.
Mitchell, Mrs. Max	51 Mountfort St., Boston, Mass.
Molineux, Miss M. A.	27 Aberdeen St., Boston, Mass.
Moneta, Signor E. T.	Milan, Italy
Montgomery, Roger W.	25 Cushing St., Cambridge, Mass.
Moody, Mrs. Annie	Shaker Station, Conn.
Morden, M. R.	Adrian, Mich.
Morel, E. D.	Manchester, England
Morey, Ellen Beale	Malden, Mass.
Morris, George P.	Congregational House, Boston, Mass.
Morris, R. W.	18 Matthews Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
Morrison, Rev. M. W.	Lexington, Va.
Morse, Miss Ellen C.	60 Burroughs St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Morse, Joshua, Jr.	1 St. Botolph Studios Annex, Boston, Mass.
Morse, Mrs. Robert	60 Burroughs St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Morss, Rev. G. B.	Montville, Conn.
Moss, Rev. Charles H.	Malden, Mass.
Moulton, Rev. J. S.	Stow, Mass.
Mowry, Miss Eudora	Greenville, Tenn.
Mowry, Walter H.	W. B. Clarke Co., 26 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
Mowry, William A.	11 Riverside Square, Hyde Park, Mass.
*Moxom, Rev. Philip S.	Springfield, Mass.
Muff, Mrs. Henry	The Red House, Bexley Heath, Kent, England

Nahmer, Mrs. H. S.	Springfield, Mass.
Nash, Charles D.	75 Crest. Ave., Chelsea, Mass.
Nash, Mrs. Frank K.	Everett St., Dorchester, Mass.
Nerinex, M. Alfred	University of Louvain, Louvain, Belgium
Neufville, Edward de	32 Lindenstrasse, Frankfort, Germany
Newell, Miss A. E.	South Boston, Mass.
Newhall, H. W.	Lynn, Mass.
Nichols, Rev. J. H.	West Derry, N. H.
Nichols, Mattie O.	Chelsea, Mass.
Nogaro, Bertrand	Paris, France
Noyes, Mrs. E. Belle	77 Main St., Haverhill, Mass.
Noyes, Mrs. Henry D.	Auburndale, Mass.
Noyes, Miss Minnie	Y. W. C. A., Berkeley St., Boston, Mass.

Offord, Daniel	Mt. Lebanon, N. Y.
Olsson, Hon. John	Stockholm, Sweden (Havana, Cuba, Poste Restante)
Ordway, A. L.	164 Park St., Medford, Mass.
Ordway, Edith B.	164 Park St., Medford, Mass.
Osborne, Charles	North Weare, N. H.
Osborne, Mrs. Lucy P.	North Weare, N. H.

Packard, Dr. Horace	470 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Packard, Mrs. Horace	470 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Page, Dr. Calvin G.	128 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Page, Mrs. Calvin G.	128 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Paine, Miss Helen	21 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass.
Paine, Isabelle Shannon	622 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
Paine, Miss Marianna	21 Brimmer St., Boston, Mass.
Paine, Hon. Robert Treat	6 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
Paine, Robert Treat, Jr.	85 State St., Boston, Mass.
Papazian, G. H.	991 Massachusetts Ave., Boston, Mass.
Park, Mrs. Maude Wood	Dennison House, Boston, Mass.
Park, Robert E.	Wollaston, Mass.
Parke, Mrs. Clara C.	362 Beale St., Wollaston, Mass.
Parker, Gilman L.	Reading, Mass.
Parker, Miss Sybil A.	201 Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass.
Parks, Miss Josephine	281 Brookline Ave., Boston, Mass.
Parsons, Albert S.	Lexington, Mass.
Parsons, Mrs. Albert S.	Lexington, Mass.
Parsons, Anna Q. T.	366 Walnut Ave., Roxbury, Mass.
Patrick, Delano	Hopedale, Mass.
Patrick, Miss Lucy S.	Hopedale, Mass.
Patterson, Rev. A. J.	84 Maple St., Roxbury, Mass.
Patterson, Mrs. Jane L.	84 Maple St., Roxbury, Mass.
Paul, Dr. Willard A.	157 Harvard St., Dorchester, Mass.
Peabody, Rev. F. G.	Cambridge, Mass.
Peabody, George Foster	27 Pine St., New York City
Peet, Dr. Edward W.	Broadway Tabernacle, New York City
Pehrson, Herr P.	Marley, Bergholm, Sweden
Pelser, Jacob	204 Heath St., Roxbury, Mass.
Penniman, Miss M. C.	Boston, Mass.
Pennoyer, Rev. Charles Huntington	Springfield, Vt.
Percival, Rev. Charles H.	76 Belmont St., Malden, Mass.
Percival, Rt. Rev. John, Bishop of Hereford	Hereford, England
Perkins, Miss L. S. W.	Concord, Mass.
Perrin, Rev. Willard T.	66 Harvard Ave., Brookline, Mass.
Perris, George H.	5 Henrietta St., London, W. C., England
Perry, Bliss	4 Park St., Boston, Mass.

Perry, Charles	Westerly, R. I.
Perry, Clara V.	Westerly, R. I.
Perry, Rev. Lawrence	Wayland, Mass.
Phelps, M. H.	New York City
Phillips, Isidore	122 Thorndike St., Brookline, Mass.
Pichot, L'Abbé	3 Rue des Penices, Monaco, France
Pickering, Henry	81 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Pickering, Mrs. Henry	81 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Pickernell, Mrs. F. A.	86 Sargent St., Newton, Mass.
Pickles, Rev. J. D.	515 Broadway, South Boston, Mass.
Pierce, Myron E.	50 State St., Boston, Mass.
Pierce, Wallace L.	S. S. Pierce Co., Boston, Mass.
Pillsbury, L. H.	Derry, N. H.
Pillsbury, Mrs. Nellie	Waban, Mass.
Place, Charles A.	First Parish Church, Waltham, Mass.
Playter, Franklin	California
Playter, Joseph H.	California
Plumb, Rev. A. H.	175 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Polk, Rev. R. T.	30 West St., Boston, Mass.
Pope, Dr. Augusta	163 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Pope, Dr. Emily	163 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Porter, Miss Grace S.	35 St. James Ave., Boston, Mass.
Potash, S.	48 Billerica St., Boston, Mass.
Post, Mrs. Angelica S.	218 West Springfield St., Boston, Mass.
Post, Miss L. C.	Brookline, Mass.
Potter, Mrs. Jennie K.	Care of J. B. Lord, 189 Montague St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Pötting, Countess	Vienna, Austria
Prang, Mrs. Louis	Roxbury, Mass.
Pratt, Mrs. John	10 Laurel Ave., Auburn, Me.
Pratt, Mrs. Sophia L.	18 Lansdowne St., Roxbury, Mass.
Preston, Elwyn G.	Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass.
Prime, Grace A.	Eliot, Me.
Prouty, Mrs. G. W.	Littleton, Mass.
Prudhommeaux, M. J.	12 rue Bourdaloue, Nîmes, France
Pryce-Jones, Col. M. P.	Newton, North Wales, Great Britain
Purington, Dr. Louise	23 Allston St., Dorchester, Mass.
Putnam, Charles P.	63 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
*Putnam, Hon. William L.	Portland, Me.
Putnam, Miss	Virginia
Quidde, Professor Ludwig	4 Leopoldstrasse, Munich, Germany
Ramsdell, Miss Hattie	Somerville, Mass.
Ranlett, C. E.	Auburndale, Mass.
Reed, Mrs. Margaret E.	1138 Adams St., Dorchester, Mass.
Reynolds, G. W.	South Manchester, Conn.
Rice, Mrs. M. E.	154 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Rice, Mrs. Mary Pamela	The Ludlow, Boston, Mass.
Richter, Dr. Adolf	Pforzheim, Germany
Ricketson, Angelina	North Dartmouth, Mass.
Riley, James	11 Union St., Boston, Mass.
Riley, William H.	Plainfield, N. J.
Riley, Mrs. William H.	Plainfield, N. J.
Robbins, R. L.	Hingham, Mass.
Roberts, Bryn, M. P.	Bryn Adda, Bangor, North Wales, Great Britain
Roberts, Ellwood	Norristown, Pa.
Roberts, Mrs. Susan M.	South Charlestown, Ohio
Robinson, Arthur W.	Natick, Mass.
Robinson, Miss J. D.	51 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.

Rogers, Anne B.	59 Elm Hill Ave., Roxbury, Mass.
Rogers, Miss Annette P.	5 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
Rogers, James S.	59 Elm Hill Ave., Roxbury, Mass.
Rowe, Mrs. M. Theresa	West Newton, Mass.
Rowe, Miss O. M. E.	City Hospital, Boston, Mass.
Rowley, Rev. Francis H.	Mason Terrace, Brookline, Mass.
Rowntree, Edith M.	Mount Villas, York, England
Roys, Rev. Cyrus A.	Uxbridge, Mass.
Ruffin, Mrs. J. St. P.	146 Charles St., Boston, Mass.
Ruyssen, Theodore	34 Boulevard du Roi-René, Aix-en-Provence, France

Sakamoto, M.	26 Brook St., Brookline, Mass.
Sallaway, Rev. James	Bedford, Mass.
Salomon, Gustav	141 Cedar St., Roxbury, Mass.
Salomon, Mrs. Gustav	141 Cedar St., Roxbury, Mass.
Sanborn, D. W.	382 Broadway, Winter Hill, Somerville, Mass.
Sanborn, Mrs. D. W.	382 Broadway, Winter Hill, Somerville, Mass.
Sanford, Daniel S.	Allerton St., Brookline, Mass.
Sargent, Mrs. D. A.	27 Everett St., Cambridge, Mass.
Sarolea, Charles, Ph. D., Belgian Consul,	Hermitage, Colinton, Edinburgh, Scotland
Sawtell, Miss Ellen C.	257 Lake Ave., Newton Highlands, Mass.
Sawyer, G. C.	94 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass.
Schauffler, Rev. Henry B.	Berlin, Conn.
Schlesinger, Mrs. Mary	Brookline, Mass.
Schlesinger, Miss Marion	Brookline, Mass.
Scott, Frank J.	Toledo, Ohio
Scott, W.	40 Dover St., West Somerville, Mass.
Scovel, Rev. Sylvester F.	Wooster, Ohio
*Schurman, Jacob G.	Ithaca, N. Y.
Seabury, Helen H.	414 County St., New Bedford, Mass.
Seabury, Mary B.	414 County St., New Bedford, Mass.
Secrist, Rev. H. T.	3 Abbotsford St., Roxbury, Mass.
Sedgwick, Mrs. William T.	Brookline, Mass.
*Seelye, L. Clarke	Northampton, Mass.
*Sewall, May Wright	Indianapolis, Ind.
*Seward, Hon. George F.	97 Cedar St., New York City
Shaw, Mrs. Hattie E.	Brockton, Mass.
Shaw, Rev. Judson W.	R. F. D. 4, Portland, Me.
Shaw, William	U. S. C. E., Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.
Shed, Joseph G.	27 Fountain St., Roxbury, Mass.
Sheerin, Rev. James	Clinton, Mass.
Sheldon, Joseph	New Haven, Conn.
Shepard, Miss E. B.	Rawson Road, Brookline, Mass.
Shephard, Walter S.	Shaker Station, Conn.
Sherwin, Edward	141 Milk St., Boston, Mass.
Sherwin, Mrs. Thomas	Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Shirley, Mrs. C. F.	West Newton, Mass.
Shoemaker, Joseph M.	Sandy Spring, Md.
Short, Miss Josephine H.	Eustis, Fla.
Shotwell, Dr. J. H.	Asbury Park, N. J.
Shotwell, Mary B.	Asbury Park, N. J.
Silva, Madame	Boston, Mass.
Sioussat, Mrs. Albert	Lake Roland, Baltimore Co., Md.
Sisson, Charles	Providence, R. I.
Sisson, Mrs. E. D. E.	Providence, R. I.
Smiley, Albert K.	Lake Mohonk, Ulster Co., N. Y.
Smiley, Mrs. Daniel	Lake Mohonk, Ulster Co., N. Y.
Smith, Adolphe	National Liberal Club, London, England
Smith, Mrs. Anna Harris	Brookline, Mass.
*Smith, Edwin Burritt	First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

Smith, Emily B.	Amesbury, Mass.
Smith, Mrs. H. C.	371 Northampton St., Boston, Mass.
Smith, Mrs. Henry H.	83 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass.
Smith, John B.	Berlin, Conn.
Smith, Rev. John L.	North Berwick, Me.
Smith, Mrs. John L.	North Berwick, Me.
Smith, Dr. Mary A.	33 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Smith, Miss May C.	Clayton, Mass.
Smith, Miss S. Marie	8 Arlington St., Boston, Mass.
Smock, J. C.	Hudson, N. Y.
Snape, Hon. Thomas	Liverpool, England
Southard, Rev. James L.	Wellesley Hills, Mass.
Southey, Mrs. E. M.	20 Carlisle Road, West Brighton, Sussex, England
Southworth, Miss Alice H.	Boston, Mass.
Southworth, Mrs.	Boston, Mass.
Southworth, Mrs. Louisa	844 Prospect St., Cleveland, Ohio
*Spalding, Bishop John L.	Peoria, Ill.
Spaulding, Mrs. A. P.	3042 Washington St., Boston, Mass.
Spencer, Mrs. Anna Garlin	57 West 44th St., New York City
Spencer, Mrs. Lorillard	Care of Miss Mason, R. I. Ave., Newport, R. I.
Spencer, Emily C.	28 Moultrie St., Dorchester, Mass.
Spicer, R. B.	140 North 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Sprague, Dr. Homer B.	Newton, Mass.
Spray, Ruth H.	Salida, Col.
Stackpole, Rev. M. W.	Magnolia, Mass.
Stanwood, Daniel C.	Pemberton Building, Boston, Mass.
Stanwood, Miss Harriet	704 Congregational House, Boston, Mass.
Start, Edwin A.	Billerica, Mass.
Stearns, Rev. G. W.	Middleboro, Mass.
Stein, Prof. Robert	Washington, D. C.
Stephen, A. H.	Raewood, Dundee, Scotland
Stevens, Dr. Charles W.	Broadway Tabernacle, New York City
Sterling, Henry	52 Federal St., Boston, Mass.
Stevens, Miss Mary E.	Dover, N. H.
Stevenson, Mrs. Katherine Lente	14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Stewart, W. D.	Melrose, Mass.
Stirling, Charles R.	11 Sunset St., Roxbury, Mass.
St. John, Mrs. T. E.	Eastport, Me.
Stoddard, Rev. Charles A.	New York Observer, New York City
Stoddard, Rev. James P.	560 Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass.
*Stokes, J. G. Phelps	100 William St., New York City
Stone, Miss Ellen M.	9 Crescent Ave., Chelsea, Mass.
Stone, Miss Katherine	Old South Meeting House, Boston, Mass.
Stone, L. R.	Newton, Mass.
Storey, Moorfield	53 State St., Boston, Mass.
Straus, Hon. Oscar S.	5 West 76th St., New York City
Strickland, Miss Anna E.	New Britain, Conn.
Strong, Rev. Josiah	287 Fourth Ave., New York City
Stuckenberg, Mrs. J. H. W.	17 Arlington St., Cambridge, Mass.
Sturge, Miss Sophia	447 Hagley Road, Birmingham, England
Sturgis, H. O.	Windsor, England
Sunderland, Rev. J. T.	650 Ontario St., Toronto, Can.
Surtess, Rev. J. L.	Manasquan, N. J.
Suttner, Baroness Bertha von	Hermansdorf-Eggenburg, Vienna, Austria
Sutton, George H.	317 Main St., Springfield, Mass.
Symonds, Mrs. Edith D.	129 North St., Salem, Mass.
Swan, Elizabeth W.	2 Derne St., Boston, Mass.
Swan, Martha C.	2 Derne St., Boston, Mass.
Swan, Mary B.	2 Derne St., Boston, Mass.
Sweet, Rev. W. I.	7 Orchard St., Everett, Mass.
Swift, D. Wheeler	Worcester, Mass.

Swift, Mary G.	Millbrook, N. Y.
Swift, Sarah J.	Worcester, Mass.
Swift, Henry H.	Millbrook, N. Y.
Tagen, George F.	20 K St., South Boston, Mass.
Talcott, Mrs. George Sherman	New Britain, Conn.
Tapley, Alice P.	Hotel Vendome, Boston, Mass.
Tarbox, Myron H.	59 Hyde Ave., Newton, Mass.
Tatum, Mrs. Edward	Park Avenue Hotel, New York City
*Taylor, Prof. Graham	Chicago Commons, Chicago, Ill.
Tebb, Mrs. William	Rede Hall, Burstow, Surrey, England
Thayer, Hon. Samuel R.	Minneapolis, Minn.
Thomas, George Gale	24 Heath Hurst Road, Hampstead, London, England
Thomas, G. Lienfer	Swansea, England
*Thomas, Rev. Hiram W.	535 Munroe St., Chicago, Ill.
Thomas, John L.	Pendleton, Ind.
*Thomas, Miss M. Carey	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Thompson, Dr. Edward	Omaph, Co. Tyrone, Ireland
Thomson, Mrs. Alexander	411 Main St., Fitchburg, Mass.
Thorpe, Mrs. E. J. E.	Dorchester, Mass.
Tibbaut, M. E.	Gand, Belgium
Tiffany, Rev. Francis	Cambridge, Mass.
Tileston, Roger E.	161 Pearl St., Boston, Mass.
Tillinghast, Mrs. Ada W.	37 Eighth St., New Bedford, Mass.
Tillinghast, Charlotte L.	Angel St., Providence, R. I.
Tillinghast, Mrs. E. S.	New Haven, Conn.
Tilton, Rev. G. H.	Woburn, Mass.
Tingley, Mr. S. H.	22 Benevolent St., Providence, R. I.
Tinkham, Mrs. Kathryn	Brockton, Mass.
Tobey, Miss Elizabeth	Boston, Mass.
Tobey, Mr. R. B.	178 Devonshire St., Boston, Mass.
Tobin, John F.	432 Albany Building, Boston, Mass.
Todd, Mrs. Harriet T.	14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Todd, Miss Hattie L.	8 Frothingham Ave., Charlestown, Mass.
Tolman, Miss Emily	Box 155, Arlington, Mass.
Tolman, J. P.	84 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Tolman, Mrs. J. P.	84 Highland St., Roxbury, Mass.
Torrey, Elbridge	Dorchester, Mass.
Tosi, H. P.	7 Hanover St., Boston, Mass.
Toulon, Miss S. E.	Boston, Mass.
Troup, Charles A. H.	17 Myrtle St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Trueblood, Dr. Benjamin F.	31 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Trueblood, Miss Lyra D.	9 Crawford St., Roxbury, Mass.
Trueblood, Miss Florence E.	9 Crawford St., Roxbury, Mass.
Tucker, Sarah Frances	Brush Hill, Milton, Mass.
Turner, Miss Harriet E.	25 Winthrop Ave., Wollaston, Mass.
Tuttle, Mrs. Oliver M.	Winthrop Centre, Me.
Tweedey, Mrs. J. F.	Spuyten Duyvil, New York City
Twombly, John Fogg	34 Green St., Brookline, Mass.
Underhill, Mrs. Sue Smiley	Redlands, Cal.
Upton, Miss M. L.	533 Massachusetts Ave., Boston, Mass.
Vincent, Miss S. N.	378 Marlboro St., Boston, Mass.
Wagner, Pastor Charles	2 Rue des Arquebusiers, Paris, France
Walcott, Erwin H.	77 Summer St., Boston, Mass.

Waldron, Rev. D. W.	14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Waldron, Dr. Mabel W.	Lynn, Mass.
Walker, Mrs. Harriet D.	14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
Walsh, Rev. Walter	Gilfillan Memorial Church, Dundee, Scotland
Walton, Mrs. E. N. L.	68 Chestnut St., West Newton, Mass.
Walton, George A.	68 Chestnut St., West Newton, Mass.
Ward, Herbert D.	Newton Centre, Mass.
Ware, Mrs. L. C.	39 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
Ware, Mrs. M. D.	51 Wellington St., Worcester, Mass.
Warner, Miss Martha J.	Selma, Ohio
Warren, Mrs. Abbie P.	66 Westland Ave., Boston, Mass.
Warren, Mrs. Frederick	336 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
*Warren, Bishop Henry W.	University Park, Denver, Col.
Washburn, Andrew	68 Dudley St., Brookline, Mass.
Washington, Booker T.	Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.
Waters, Henry F.	Melrose, Mass.
Weatherley, Rev. Arthur L.	Worcester, Mass.
Webster, Andrew G.	55 High St., Boston, Mass.
Weld, Dr. C. R.	Hotel Vendome, Boston, Mass.
Weld, Mrs. C. R.	Hotel Vendome, Boston, Mass.
Wellman, C. P.	Montpelier, Vt.
Wells, Amos R.	Tremont Temple, Boston, Mass.
Wells, Mrs. Webster	Hotel Beaconsfield, Brookline, Mass.
Wells, William S.	Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.
Welsh, Herbert	1305 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Wendte, Rev. Charles W.	222 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass.
Wendte, Mrs. Charles W.	222 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass.
Weston, Martha G.	Brockton, Mass.
Westrope, Rev. Richard	York, England
Wheaton, Carl M.	Newton Highlands, Mass.
Wheeler, Andrew	55 High St., Boston, Mass.
Wheeler, Mrs. C. H.	Worcester, Mass.
Weeeler, Emily C.	Worcester, Mass.
Wheelock, Rev. A. H.	Pepperell, Mass.
Wheelwright, Andrew C.	73 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Wheelwright, Mrs. Andrew C.	73 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Whipple, George M.	Salem, Mass.
Whipple, Thomas G.	Mystic, Conn.
White, Miss Amy	South St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
*White, Hon. Andrew D.	Ithaca, N. Y.
White, Mary	Hectors River, Jamaica, W. I.
White, Miss Willa W.	Huntington Chambers, Boston, Mass.
Whiteley, James Gustavus	223 West Lanvale St., Baltimore, Md.
Whiting, Miss Susan A.	11 Washington St., Newton, Mass.
Whiting, Hon. William W.	Holyoke, Mass.
Whitman, Mrs. F. S.	23 Everett St., Cambridge, Mass.
Whitmore, Rev. J. Herman	Stoneham, Mass.
Whitmore, Mrs. J. Herman	Stoneham, Mass.
Whitney, Mrs. Henry A.	65 Pearl St., Charlestown, Mass.
Whitney, Mrs. Henry M.	Brookline, Mass.
Whytal, William	Arlington, Mass.
Wiggin, Mrs. Frank H.	15 Wren St., West Roxbury, Mass.
Wilbur, Henry W.	9 West 14th St., New York City
Wilbur, Mrs. Henry W.	9 West 14th St., New York City
Wilde, Miss Katherine	3 Park St., Boston, Mass.
Wilder, Miss E. F.	Newton, Mass.
Wiley, Mrs. E. E.	Tennessee
Wilkinson, M.	Framingham, Mass.
Willard, H. M.	Wollaston, Mass.
Willard, Mrs. H. M.	Wollaston, Mass.
Willets, Miss Mary	Sea Girt, N. J.

Williams, Miss Dora	Normal School, Dartmouth St., Boston, Mass.
Williams, Mrs. Joseph	128 Lakeview Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Williams, Rev. Leonard	Sabattius, Me.
Williams, Mrs. Margaret R.	East Orange, N. J.
Willson, Helen	Boston, Mass.
Wilmarth, Mrs. M. R.	West Boxford, Mass.
Wilson, Isaac	Bloomfield, Ontario, Can.
Wilson, John M.	Fall River, Mass.
Wilson, Miss Maria P.	145 Main St., Malden, Mass.
Wilson, William J.	211 Shurtleff St., Chelsea, Mass.
Wingate, Miss Hannah	13 West 129th St., New York City
Winkley, M. H.	331 Massachusetts Ave., Boston, Mass.
Winslow, Erving	27 Central St., Boston, Mass.
Winslow, Dr. G. M.	145 Woodland St., Auburndale, Mass.
Winslow, Mrs. G. M.	145 Woodland St., Auburndale, Mass.
Wixon, Susan H.	Fall River, Mass.
Wolkins, George G.	50 Congress St., Boston, Mass.
Wood, Carolena M.	Mount Kisco, N. Y.
Wood, Mrs. David S.	Wellesley Hills, Mass.
Wood, Juliana	Philadelphia, Pa.
Wood, Richard	1620 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Wood, Thomas	215 State St., Boston, Mass.
Woodard, Dr. Marian L.	2 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass.
Woodbury, Miss L. R	51 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Woodbury, Miss Mary	51 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Woodbury, Miss W.	51 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
Woodman, Rev. Charles M.	Portland, Me.
*Woodruff, Clinton Rogers	North American Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Woodward, Miss E. A.	Keene, N. H.
Worthington, Mrs. J. A. H.	Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y.
Wright, J. Edward	Montpelier, Vt.
Wright, Phebe C.	Sea Girt, N. J.
Wright, Thomas	Coafton, Bedford, England
Wright, William	Arlington, Mass.
Wuarin, Prof. Louis	University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

Yates, Elizabeth Upham	Houlton, Me.
Young, Miss Caroline A.	50 State St., Boston, Mass.
Young, Rev. George M.	Fairville, St. John, N. B.

Zillenski, Jonas	149 Dorchester St., South Boston, Mass.

Appendix A.

LETTER FROM SIR JOHN MACDONELL OF LONDON.

31 Kensington Park Gardens, W., September 21, 1904.

My dear Mr. Perris: It has for some time been plain to me that I could not for many reasons be present at the Congress at Boston. This is very much to my regret. I greatly desired to meet and talk with the workers in the cause of peace in a country where that cause flourishes much more, I believe, than it does with us at present, and which is beset by fewer of the temptations to militarism than the Old World.

No doubt the Congress, where all shades of opinion will be represented, will look at the question from many sides; and I am hopeful that among other matters under consideration one or two points which I have much at heart will not be forgotten. Two of them are, I conceive, of no small practical importance. One of them is the urgent necessity of developing, I might even say creating, a form of literature specially designed to meet the wants of the hour. A literature which may help to counteract in some degree the ceaseless appeals through the eye and ear, by print and picture, to the worst passions; a literature truly pacific in spirit, not sentimental in character, not full of vague generalities, but containing precise details and authentic tests, and presenting in plain language the realities of war; revealing what is behind the soldiers' triumphs, making audible what the blare of trumpets and the shouts of infatuated mobs now drown.

Art and literature, one is of late tempted to think, have deserted the cause of peace and are in a conspiracy against it. Can they be brought back to the side of common sense and humanity? I am not underrating the services rendered by the excellent existing periodicals, or the value of such publications as those issued by the *Bibliothèque Pacifiste Internationale;* but each country needs its own special form of peace literature, and I should be glad to see everywhere organizations for the purposes of disseminating, by books and pamphlets, facts which are now glossed over and kept in the background; a literature with the motto, *écrasons l'infame* — the true *infame* of all time. A carefully prepared volume of extracts from writers of authority descriptive of war as it is — war put to the test of common sense — showing men lowered to the level of wild beasts, every evil passion let loose, and the result almost always manifestly futile and disappointing, would be useful. I should also like to see a wide circulation of accurate pictorial representations of war as it is, and not in its false, glorified, idealized forms. Copies of some of Verestschagin's vivid pictures of its grim realities would be more convincing than labored arguments or exhortations. In the formation of such an organization I would gladly help.

Another practical point is one of which I have, more than once, talked with you; the need of making the question of peace one much more of practical politics than it is in England at all events. Can we not have organizations which will secure prominence to this question at every political election in every country; organizations which will endeavor to elicit from every candidate precise pledges as to this matter? If temperance be made a test question, why not peace, transcending in importance in this age, perhaps in most ages, I am inclined to think, all others?

In stating my last point I am running the risk of being misunderstood, but not, I think, in the city of Channing and Emerson, and of so many other great moral teachers. Those who plead for peace should take note of the fact that mankind, especially youth, longs for the heroic. It is captivated by the spectacle of self-denial, endurance of privations, and readiness to sacrifice life itself. Men are not very curious to inquire into the merits of the cause in which these virtues are enlisted. Young minds are fascinated and seduced by this aspect of war, to a forgetfulness of its horrors, brutality and attendant wickedness. It would be well if the advocates of peace would dwell oftener than they do upon the fact that the heroic, all that is truly noble in the conduct of the best soldiers, can be realized in peaceful life. In fighting with disease the physician and the nurse exhibit it. So does the rescue party which goes down a mine after an explosion. So does the crew of a lifeboat. All that is admitted. What is rarely inculcated is that the ordinary duties of all vocations, strenuously practised, quite apart from the emergencies of life, may and do call for the exercise and display of true heroism; greater because it is the outcome of calm personal resolve, and is not obedience under circumstances of excitement to a collective command.

I should be glad if in the peace literature were heard oftener than I can now detect the heroic note — the incentive to live laborious days, to endure hardships, and to risk health and life itself in the performance of its ordinary civic duties. We cannot afford to allow it to be assumed that war alone calls forth the heroic virtues.

Excuse these few reflections, which I close with renewed expressions of my great regret at my absence from a Congress which may prove a momentous event in a struggle to cast off the heaviest weight resting on our civilization.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN MACDONELL.

RESOLUTION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD MASSACHUSETTS REGIMENT ASSOCIATION.

Resolved, That we, the Twenty-third Regiment Association, formerly the Twenty-third Massachusetts Regiment Volunteer Infantry, in reunion assembled, this twenty-eighth day of September, nineteen hundred and four, hereby desire to place ourselves on record as being most bitterly opposed to the toleration of war, and as ever advocating those measures which shall make for peace; and for these reasons we declare ourselves as being most emphatically in favor of universal arbitration by the nations of the world of all differences which may arise between them.

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the records of the Association, and a copy of the same, signed by the President and the Adjutant, be sent to the International Peace Congress, which is shortly to convene in Boston.

GEORGE M. WHIPPLE, *President*,
DAVID P. MUSSEY, *Adjutant*,
Twenty-third Massachusetts Regiment Association.

SALEM, MASS., September 30, 1904.

APPEAL OF THE ALLIANCE UNIVERSELLE DES FEMMES POUR LA PAIX PAR L'EDUCATION TO THE BOSTON PEACE CONGRESS.

Whereas, The future of peoples depends upon the education given to the children;

Whereas, A program of pacific education has not yet been adequately worked out, defined and spread abroad;

The *Alliance* appeals to all true friends of peace to unite their efforts for the creation in all countries of the largest possible number of Peace Centres, where men and women of intelligence,— leaders of thought, sociologists, educators,— filled with the peace spirit, may meet regularly to study thoroughly the great problem of pacific education, to work out a program for such education, and to secure the coöperation of educators of both sexes in the practical application of this program in the instruction of youth.

PARIS, FRANCE, 7 bis rue du Débarcadère.

EXTRACT FROM AN ADDRESS TO THE CONGRESS BY THE SHAKER SOCIETY OF MT. LEBANON, N. Y.

This great International Peace Congress has met to discuss the causes of war, and to set in operation a method that shall prevent war and secure universal peace. We fully appreciate the noble work in which this International Peace Congress is engaged, and we believe that it is the interest of every sincere worker in the cause of universal peace to know what are the underlying causes of war, and, by international effort, to apply the remedy.

The founders of the Shaker Order have, in all their religious teachings, proclaimed the truism that there is no effect without a cause, and we declare to the whole world, as represented at this Congress, that the violation of the great Law of Life is the cause of all war, misery and woe existing in individual, society and national life. Obedience to the law of God in nature will confer on every child the inalienable right to be well born. To be well born gives liberty, which is freedom from sin; being free from sin we have peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." "Blessed are the pure in heart (those that are clean in thought and imagination), for they shall see God," in all their fellow beings of every race and color.

Sin entering at the source of human life, all the streams flowing therefrom are corrupted, and we have the result manifest throughout the whole world, in sickness and disease, in competition and oppression, in wars and fightings.

In the Declaration of Independence was declared the equality of *all* men. The Shaker Order, through the revelation of the Motherhood in God, declares the equality of all women as well as all men. In the Shaker Order, recognizing a heavenly Mother, women have equal rights with men, and stand in their God-given liberty. The voice of woman is heard all over the world, declaring her inalienable right to stand side by side with her brother, and, uniting their efforts, to bring about the glorious time — the fulfilment of prophecy — of peace on earth, goodwill to men and women, and to all our fellow creatures who speak so eloquently in their silent language. We give expression to our deep and solemn conviction that until we acknowledge the duality of Deity, and organically admit woman to equality with man and confer upon her all the rights we claim for ourselves, all our efforts to abolish war will be futile.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL PHONETIC CONFERENCE TO ADOPT A UNIVERSAL ALPHABET.

FROM A PAPER PRESENTED BY ROBERT STEIN.

Nearly all modern wars have been due to the fact that people did not understand one another. When you know little or nothing of your neighbor, you are only too apt to picture him as a monster, to be exterminated. Slowly, very slowly, we are learning to resign ourselves to the conviction that most of our fellow-men are no more horrible than we are.

If we are to get along pleasantly during our stay on this little planet, we must first understand each other. It is pleasant to note, therefore, that some of the societies here represented make it their aim not merely to denounce war, but to remove the causes of war. That is the method of modern medicine. The main cause of war, as has been stated, is lack of mutual understanding. One of the foremost aims of the friends of péace, therefore, must be to remove the barriers that prevent mutual understanding. These barriers are not merely geographic. Language is the portal through which we enter into each other's minds, and language nowadays for the most part means print.

In the Roman alphabet we already have practically a universal alphabet. Still in its present condition it is as yet far from being a perfect tool for the conveyance of thought. If every one of its letters represented only one sound, children, even without going to school, could hardly avoid learning to read any more than they can avoid learning to talk. As it is, owing to the variations in the values of letters, a large part of the population in various countries is condemned to illiteracy. In learning foreign languages, the written speech and the spoken speech ought to be mutual aids; at present they are apt to be mutual hindrances.

Picture to yourselves the impetus that would be given to education if every child could read the moment it knew the letters. How long would it take? Place a child in a school room with forty other children and in less than a month it will know their names and faces. In less than a month, too, it will know the looks and uses of forty letters, if they always represent the same sounds. The art of reading would be acquired with even less trouble than the art of playing ball. The formidable item of spelling lessons would almost vanish from the curriculum. Economy of time is the main condition of improved education, and no economy could be greater than that of a simplified alphabet.

The sounds of foreign languages are for the most part the same as in ours. If they were written with the same letters, every one could at once pronounce them correctly, with the exception of a few special sounds for each language, the signs for which could be learned in an hour.

Universal alphabets have been constructed by the score. Why has not one of them come into general use? The reason is evident. In nearly every case the inventor of a universal alphabet proceeded on his own hook, as the saying is, without consulting his fellow-workers. The result has been that not one of these alphabets has acquired the requisite authority. Evidently the time is passed when one man could so overshadow his fellow-men that his single authority would be universally accepted. Authority nowadays resides in bodies of men officially designated. If, then, we wish to have an authoritative universal alphabet, it must be created by an officially appointed body of men.

To prepare the way for such a measure, Boston University has issued a circular inviting the opinions of the learned public on the proposal to hold an international phonetic conference for the purpose of adopting a universal alphabet. Out of seventy-three replies thus far received, only four question the utility of such a conference. The great majority are enthusiastic in their approval.

By this time I feel sure that a question has arisen in your minds. A universal alphabet created by the highest authority would no doubt be a very fine thing, but how can it be introduced into general use? Will the public awake one fine morning with a determination to write no longer in the old fashion, but in the new? Whoever knows the public is well aware that that interesting organism will do nothing of the kind. The old orthography represents a vast stream, pouring forth from myriads of printing presses into millions of minds carved and smoothed by years of practice to receive it without friction. That this vast flood can suddenly be turned into a new channel is out of the question.

In this emergency we may learn a lesson from the Prince of Darkness. Theologians tell us that the devil would have no chance to draw a single human soul from the path of rectitude did not that soul itself offer him some handle of which he may take hold. Having got hold of the little finger, he presently seizes the whole hand and the whole individual. Wishing to draw the public from the crooked path of the old orthography into the path of rectitude of the new, how shall we get hold of its little finger?

A large part of the public are in the habit of consulting dictionaries. Now every dictionary has a key to pronunciation, which constitutes practically a phonetic alphabet. Thus, whenever one consults the dictionary, his eye rests on a phonetic spelling. Were this spelling the same in every dictionary, many people would unconsciously learn it by heart. It would soon be introduced in every primer, reader, grammar and language manual, and thus children would become accustomed to it in their early years.

This, then, is the little finger which will presently give us possession of the whole hand and of the whole man. Get all the dictionaries to adopt the same key to pronunciation, and let this key be of such nature that it shall be most convenient also for ordinary writing and printing, and the public will get into the habit of copying it not only without repugnance but even with avidity. Experiment has proved that children beginning with a phonetic spelling not only learn to read and write in a few weeks, but master even the traditional spelling more readily than by the old method. When a universal alphabet, more perfect than any now in existence, and constituting a key to the pronunciation of all the leading languages, has been adopted by the highest authority, that of an international commission of experts, it is safe to say that many schools will repeat the experiment of beginning with this alphabet. When the public is thus made familiar with the fact that by this method the labor of acquiring even the traditional spelling is reduced by one-half, it will not be long before the practice is adopted in all the schools.

So far as the dictionaries are concerned, the battle is already won. The editors and publishers of the great American dictionaries have declared with practical unanimity that if a universal alphabet were adopted by a commission invested with the requisite authority, and possessing the requisite scientific standing, they would introduce that alphabet as an indicator of pronunciation in future editions of their publications as fast as practicable.

The scholars ready and anxious to do the work exist; their names are well known. All that is needed is a sum of money to pay the expenses of the conference. Thirty thousand dollars would probably suffice. In a country like ours, where the donations for public purposes have in recent years approximated $100,000,000 a year, it seems almost absurd to say that it would be difficult to obtain the small sum needed to accomplish a work which is to banish illiteracy, double the chances of education for every child, and remove an odious barrier to a good understanding among the nations.

Appendix B.

ANGLO-FRENCH TREATY OF OCTOBER 14, 1903.

The government of the French Republic and the government of H. B. Majesty, signatories of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes concluded at The Hague July 29, 1899;

Considering that by Article 19 of this Convention the High Contracting Parties reserved to themselves the conclusion of agreements with a view to recourse to arbitration in all cases which they might judge capable of submission to it,

Have authorized the undersigned to agree as follows:

ARTICLE I. Differences of a judicial order, or relative to the interpretation of existing treaties between the two contracting parties, which may arise, and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of Arbitration established by the Convention of July 29, 1899, at The Hague, on condition, however, that neither the vital interests nor the independence or honor of the two contracting states, nor the interests of any state other than the two contracting states, are involved.

ARTICLE II. In each particular case the High Contracting Parties, before addressing themselves to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, shall sign a special agreement determining clearly the subject of dispute, the extent of the arbitral powers, and the details to be observed in the constitution of the arbitral tribunal and the procedure.

ARTICLE III. The present arrangement is concluded for a period of five years from the date of signature.

CAMBON.
LANSDOWNE.

LONDON, October 14, 1903.

THE NETHERLANDS-DENMARK TREATY OF FEBRUARY 12, 1904.

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands and His Majesty the King of Denmark, moved by the principles of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, concluded at The Hague on the 29th of July, 1899, and desiring to establish especially in all reciprocal relations the principle of obligatory arbitration by a general agreement in accord with Article 19 of the said treaty, have resolved to enter into a treaty to that end, and have appointed their plenipotentiaries, to wit:

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands:

Mr. Jacob Dirk Carel, Baron van Heeckeren van Kell, Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to His Majesty the King of Denmark, Knight of the Order of the Netherlands Lion;

His Majesty the King of Denmark:

Mr. John Henrik Deuntzer, Chairman of the Cabinet Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Grand Cross of the Danebrog Order and bearer of the honorary cross of the same order, etc.;

Who, having exchanged their powers plenipotentiary, which were found to be in proper order, have agreed to the following provisions:

ARTICLE I. The High Contracting Powers undertake to submit to the Permanent Court of Arbitration all mutual differences and disputes that cannot be solved by means of a diplomatic channel.

ARTICLE II. In every case the High Contracting Powers, prior to submitting the case to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, shall sign a special agreement, clearly describing the subject of the litigation, the extent of the powers of the arbitrators, and the time which shall be observed in regard to the composition of the arbitral tribunal and the procedure.

ARTICLE III. That it be understood that Article I does not apply to disputes between subjects of any of the contracting states and those of the other contracting state, to the adjudicating of which the courts of justice of the last-mentioned state are empowered according to its own laws.

ARTICLE IV. States non-signatory to this treaty shall be allowed to adhere to the same. The state desirous of adhering shall notify each of the contracting states in writing of its intention.

Adhesion shall follow from the day on which the adhering state shall advise that each of these states has notified it of the receipt of its intimation.

ARTICLE V. In case one of the contracting states should withdraw from this treaty, such withdrawal shall only take place one year after the notice thereof is given in writing to each of the other contracting states.

ARTICLE VI. This treaty shall be ratified as soon as possible, and the exchange of the acts of ratification shall take place at The Hague.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have hereto set their hands and affixed their seals.

[Signed] CAREL VAN HEECKEREN.
[Signed] DEUNTZER.

COPENHAGEN, the 12th of February, 1904.

Index.

(Names of speakers in small capitals.)

ABRATANI, JIRO, 4; address of, 270.
ADDAMS, MISS JANE, addresses of, 119, 145, 261.
ALEXANDER, JOSEPH G., 9, 41, 59, 70, 175, 177; address of, 64; remarks of, 96, 150, 157, 165, 247, 276, 282.
Alliance Universelle des Femmes, 341.
Alsace-Lorraine, question of, 100–101.
American Manufacturers and International Arbitration, *A. B. Farquhar*, 112.
AMES, DR. CHARLES G., 6; remarks of, 156, 210.
Anglo-French Arbitration Treaty, 345.
Appeal to the Nations, 293.
Arbitration Treaties, in 1903–1904, 52; 60, 150-157, 197-198, 201, 204, 247, 278–280, 296.
Armaments, reduction of, resolution on, 296.
Armenian question, 50, 52, 203–209, 222, 223, 250, 265, 297.
ARNHOLD, GEORG, remarks of, 110.
ATKINSON, EDWARD, address of, 107.
Australia, greetings from, 57.

Baily, Joshua, 288.
BAIN, MISS WILHELMINA SHERIFF, remarks of, 127, 285.
Bajer, Frederick, on a pacific alliance of states, 196–197.
Banquet in Horticultural Hall, 252-269.
Barclay, Sir. Thomas, 88, 103; message to Peace Congress, 56.
Barnes, William, Sr., 287.
Bates, Gov. John L., message to Peace Congress, 23; reception to delegates, 166.
Berkowitz, Rabbi, 6.
BHARATI, BABA, 4; remarks of, 91.
Bryn-Roberts, Hon. John, 165.
BURROWS, HERBERT, addresses of, 140, 206; remarks of, 273, 289.
Business men's interest in the cause of international peace, 102–116.
BYLES, W. P., remarks of, 163.
BYLES, MRS. W. P., addresses of, 117, 256; remarks of, 214.
Byrne, Vicar-General, letter from, 199.

CAPEN, HON. SAMUEL B., address of, 84.
Carnegie, Andrew 42, 48, 166, 212; letter of greeting from, 53; message to, 88.
Carrington, Henry B., 163.
Catholics interested in peace, 198–199.
CHIRURG, DR. M., 4; remarks of, 92, 99, 165, 272.
Christian Endeavor Peace Congress rally, 74–87.
CLARK, DR. FRANCIS E., remarks of, 74, 77.
CLARK, DR. GAVIN BROWN, 59, 96, 200; remarks of, 155, 164, 208, 274.
CLERGET, PROF. PIERRE, 4, 59; remarks of, 48, 292.
COLLINS, HON. PATRICK A., remarks of, 24.
Committee on Organization, 3.
Committees of Peace Congress, appointment of, 59.

Congo Question, 199, 229–238, 259, 265, 274–276; resolutions on, 274, 298.

Coombs, Hon. William J., remarks of, 159.

Cost of wars, 288, 300.

Cremer, William Randal, 4, 9, 155, 197, 203, 212, 252; remarks of, 95, 156, 208, 245, 289.

Curran, Pete, addresses of, 136, 182, 201.

Current Questions, Committee on, 59; report of, 93, 203, 222, 273, 276; resolutions of, 93, 101, 160, 274.

Daily religious services, 58.

Danish-Netherlands Arbitration Treaty, text of, 345.

Darby, Dr. W. Evans, 9, 10, 12, 59; address of, 69; presents report of Committee A, 93, 156, 160, 222, 273-274; remarks of, 160, 165, 196, 222, 275, 276.

Davis, Hayne, remarks of, 156.

Delegates to Peace Congress, 311.

Deyo, Rev. Amanda, 285.

Dole, Rev. Charles F., 59; remarks of, 162, 210, 224, 232, 233-235, 238, 242, 285, 286.

Doukhobors, The, 262.

Ducommun, Elie, report of, 50; message to, 88.

Duncan, James, address of, 147.

Dunhill, Miss Helen E., address of, 147.

Dunlop, Rev. J. J., 74.

Economic causes of war, *J. Prudhommeaux*, 282; resolutions on, 299.

Economic Club, luncheon to delegates, 59.

Educators, their responsibility in creating right ideals of international life, 167–180.

Elliott, Rev. Michael J., address of, 77.

Episcopal Convention, message of greeting to, 58; sends greeting to Peace Congress, 210.

d'Estournelles de Constant, Baron, 32, 55, 62.

Farquhar, A. B., address of, 112.

Feldhaus, Richard, 59; address of, 185.

Franco-German rapprochement, 296.

Frothingham, Paul Revere, address of, 242.

General Committee of Peace Congress, 2.

German delegates, reception to, 195.

Gibbons, Cardinal, letter from, 199.

Gignoux, Claude, 59; address of, 144.

Gilbert, Hon. John I., 59, 163.

Ginn, Edwin, 213, 255; address of, 216.

Gompers, Samuel, address of, 134.

Green, J. Frederick, 59; brings message from Socialists, 200; remarks of, 206.

Greeting, letters, telegrams and cablegrams of, 53-57.

Hague Court, work and influence of, 60-73; 157, 249, 257, 294.

Hale, Dr. Edward Everett, 2, 12, 31; remarks of, 58, 198.

Hall, Pres. G. Stanley, address of, 232.

Haskins, David Greene, 3, 287.

Hay, Hon. John, 17, 25, 26, 27, 29, 39, 41, 53, 94, 162, 252, 292; address of, 18.

Head, George Herbert, address of, 232.

Hereford, Bishop of, 6, 253, 257; address of, 25.

Hoar, Hon. George F., death of, 18, 22, 23, 65.

Houzeau de Lehaie, Auguste, 4, 12, 59, 165; reports for Committee A, 100, 203; response of, 36.

Howe, Mrs. Julia Ward, address of, 126; remarks of, 98.

International Governmental Peace Conference, call for second, 29, 32, 47, 159, 160, 162, 257, 263; resolution on, 166.

International Law, Committee on Questions of, 59; report of, 150, 196; resolutions of, 153, 158, 276.

International Law Association, 40, 41, 64.

International Peace Bureau at Berne, 45, 48, 150, 214, 276, 282, 284, 287; report for 1904, 50.

Interparliamentary Peace Union, 28, 29, 47, 158, 161, 246, 252; pilgrimage of, 257, 263.

Italian Citizens of Boston, Peace Meeting, 195.

JACKSON, FREDERICK H., address of, 114.

JAMES, PROF. WILLIAM, address of, 266.

JEFFERSON, REV. CHARLES E., address of, 191.

JONES, HON. GEORGE R., remarks of, 23.

JOUET, ALPHONSE, 59; remarks of, 246.

KIN, DR. YAMEI, 4, 253, 256; addresses of, 125, 176, 239.

Labor, its interests in international peace, 133–149, 182, 201, 261, 263, 273, 284, 291, 294.

LAFONTAINE, HENRI, 9, 44, 59, 155, 187, 200, 203, 274; address of, 139; remarks of, 201, 275, 291.

LaFontaine, Madame Henri, 59.

LEVY, RABBI J. LEONARD, remarks of, 90.

Lilley, Rev. A. L., 5.

LINCOLN, HON. WILLIAM H., 59; remarks of, 102, 111.

LOCKWOOD, MRS. BELVA A., 4, 9, 59, 94, 98, 276, 287; reports for Committee B., 196, 197.

LOVE, ALFRED H., remarks of, 100, 164.

Lucerne, invitation for Fourteenth Congress to, 214, 286, 289, 293, 295, 298.

LUND, HON. JOHN, 4, 59; addresses of, 28, 104, 215, 262; remarks of, 98; response of, 45.

Lynching, 259–260.

Macdonell, Sir John, letter from, 286.

MAGILL, DR. E. H., remarks of, 98.

MAYNARD, L. A., 212; remarks of, 94.

Mayor of Boston receives delegates at Public Library, 101.

MCCALL, HON. SAMUEL, address of, 181; remarks of, 185, 187, 191.

MCNEILL, GEORGE E., remarks of, 133.

MEAD, EDWIN D., 2, 3, 5, 167, 244, 289; address of welcome, 31; introductory address of, 17; remarks of, 22, 24, 25, 27, 88, 286, 292.

MEAD, LUCIA AMES, 48, 59, 289, 214; address of, 211; remarks of, 117, 119, 122, 125, 136; reports for Committee C, 211.

MELIKOFF, DR. JEAN LORIS, 4; address of, 203; response of, 49.

Members of Peace Congress, List of, 322.

MILES, GEN. NELSON A., address of, 187.

Minutolo, Alfred Capece, 195.

Mohonk Lake Conferences, 49, 115.

MONETA, ERNESTO T., 4, 10, 12, 59, 195; remarks of, 94, 281; response of, 42.

Monroe Doctrine, 162.

MOREL, E. D., address of, 229.

MORRISON, REV. W. H., 259; address of, 235.

Mount Auburn, pilgrimage to, 295.

Musical Consecration Service, 6, 263.

Mutual relation of races and the menace to the world's order through the exploitation of weaker peoples, 224–243.

Native races, protection of, 224–243, 259, 265, 274–276, 288; resolutions on, 300.

Negro's interest in peace, 258–260.

Neufville, Edward de, 59.

Neutralization, *Erving Winslow*, 276; resolutions on, 300.

Neutralization of commercial zones of the ocean, *Edward Atkinson*, 107.

Nobel, Alfred, and the Nobel Committee, 28, 45, 46, 47, 55, 212.

Officers of the Congress, 4.

OFFORD, DANIEL, remarks of, 285.

Olney, Hon. Richard, 292, 293.

OLSSON, HON. JOHN, 4, 59; response of, 46.

Opening session, 17.

Pacific alliance of States, form of model treaty for, 196; resolutions on, 299.

Pacigerence, report on, 196.

PAINE, HON. ROBERT TREAT, 2, 4; elected president of Congress, 33; addresses of, 33, 294; remarks of, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 58, 102, 156, 163, 252, 256, 258, 262, 269, 270, 272.

Passy, Frederic, 9, 10, 13, 38, 174; letter from, 54; message to, 88.

Patriotism, *Bliss Perry*, 264.

PEABODY, PROF. FRANCIS G., address of, 167; remarks of, 172, 174, 176, 177.

PEABODY, GEORGE FOSTER, address of, 110.

Peace Congresses, a brief history of the, 7.

Peace Congresses and the Hague Tribunal, The, *Hon. Oscar S. Straus*, 60.

Peace Flag, 298.

Peace Prayer, 214–216, 298.

PERCIVAL, DR. JOHN, Bishop of Hereford, 6, 253, 257; address of, 25.

PERRIS, GEORGE H., 59, 262, 286; addresses of, 169, 204, 244; remarks of, 96, 287.

PERRY, BLISS, address of, 264.

PICHOT, ABBE, 4; remarks of, 59, 287; response of, 43.

Postage stamp, universal, 298.

Pratt, Hodgson, 9, 10, 11, 12; letter from, 54; message to, 88.

Preliminary meetings of Peace Congress, 5.

Preparations for Peace Congress, 5.

Progress of pacific education in France, *Prof. Theodore Ruyssen*, 175.

Progress of the Peace Movement in Europe, 244–250.

Propaganda, Committee on, 59; report from, 211, 214, 222, 287, 297, 300.

PRUDHOMMEAUX, J., 59; address of, 282.

PRYCE-JONES, COL., remarks of, 97.

QUIDDE, PROF. LUDWIG, 71, 96, 195; address of, 67; remarks of, 163, 245.

Reduction of armaments on land and sea, 162–164, 181–195, 296.

Resolutions, 93, 97, 101, 133, 149, 153, 156, 158, 160, 162, 166, 200, 203, 274, 276, 283–285, 287, 288, 289; complete list of, 296–301.

Responsibilities and duties of women in the cause of peace, *Bertha von Suttner*, 129.

RICHTER, DR. ADOLF, 4, 12, 13, 59; response of, 39.

Roosevelt, President, 19, 21, 22, 29, 32, 47, 50, 53, 67, 84, 97, 161, 162, 166, 208, 209, 257, 263, 288.

Rowley, Dr. Francis H., 5.

Russo-Japanese War, The, 50, 51, 92–100, 270–273, 293; resolutions on, 93, 296.

RUYSSEN, PROF. THEODORE, 4, 59, 213; addresses of, 175, 214; remarks of, 99, 290; response of, 37.

School of Peace, A, *Edwin Ginn*, 216.

Sewall, May Wright, 117; letter to Women's Meeting, 131.

Shaker Memorial to the Congress, 342.
Smiley, Albert K., 4; remarks of, 49, 88, 90, 91, 92, 100, 165.
Smith, Adolphe, 36, 37, 42, 49, 94, 99, 144, 203, 214, 282, 286, 288.
SNAPE, THOMAS, 9, 10; response of, 40; address of, 295.
Socialists and peace, 200.
Societies represented at Peace Congress, 311.
Stated International Congress, resolutions on, 158, 297.
Stein, Robert, extract from paper by, 342.
STRAUS, HON. OSCAR S., address of, 60.
Sturge, Miss Sophia, 125.
Supplementary public peace meetings at New York City, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, 302–306.
SUTTNER, BARONESS BERTHA VON, 4, 88, 89, 195, 197; addresses of, 128, 172, 253; remarks of, 155, 290; response of, 89.

Thomas, Dr. Reuen, 6, 10.
Tolstoy, Count, 264, 266.
TRUEBLOOD, DR. BENJAMIN F., 2, 3, 4, 11, 50, 53, 60, 64, 69, 88, 101, 273; elected Secretary of Congress, 33; remarks of, 158, 164, 209, 286.
Twentieth Century Club, reception to delegates, 30.
Twenty-Third Massachusetts Regiment, resolution of, 150, 341.

Universal alphabet, 342.
Universal language, resolution on, 298.
Universal postage stamp, resolution on, 298.
Urban, Professor, 67, 110.

Verestschagin's war pictures, 173.
Vice-Presidents, appointment of, 53; list of, 4.

WAGNER, PASTOR CHARLES, addresses of, 80, 177, 255.
WALSH, REV. WALTER, 5; addresses of, 81, 178.
WASHINGTON, BOOKER T., 262; address of, 258.
WESTROPE, REV. RICHARD, address of, 75.
White, Hon. Andrew D., 60, 64, 73.
WINSLOW, ERVING, address of, 276.
Women, their responsibilities and duties toward the peace movement, 117–132.
Wright, Thomas, 288.
WUARIN, PROF. LOUIS, address of, 247.